Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-117
Tuesday
20 June 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-117 *20 June 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Nuclear, Space Arms Talks Resume in Geneva *[TASS]* 1
Nazarkin on 50 1
Burt Confirmed Chief U.S. Arms Talks Negotiator *[TASS]* 1
Bush Statement on Geneva Negotiations Reported *[TASS]* 1
White House Spokesman Cited on Verification Issue *[TASS]* 2
Solton Warns Against Procrastination at Arms Talks *[Moscow International]* 2
'Significant' Continuity in U.S. Arms Talks Stance *[Gan in PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 2
SALT-II Anniversary, Arms Talks Resumption Noted *[Ptashnikov on Moscow Radio]* 3
NATO's Need To Modernize Arms Policy Stressed *[Kuznetsov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 4 Jun]* 4
UN Regional Conference on Disarmament Ends *[TASS]* 5

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA 1988 Economic Performance Statistics Reported *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 7

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Explains Visa Policy *[TASS]* 8
European Forum on Humanitarian Cooperation Opens 8
USSR Emigration Statistics Given *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 10 Jun]* 8
USSR, France Seek 'Common Legal Space' *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Federal Election Commission Visits USSR *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 10
Commentator Hopes U.S. Lifts Trade Restrictions *[Ptashnikov on Moscow Radio]* 10
Commentator Views U.S. Middle East Policy *[Zlatorunskiy on Moscow International]* 11
U.S. Arms Sales to Near East Criticized *[Vladimirov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jun]* 11
'Offensive' Nature of 'Global Shield-89' Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jun]* 12

China

Li Peng Remarks to Beijing Authorities Cited *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 14
USSR Ambassador to China Holds Talks With Jiyun *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 14
PRC Spokesman Comments on Zhao Ziyang Situation *[TASS]* 15
Economy Viewed; 'Two Essences' Policy Described *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 15
Beijing Situation 'Returning to Normal' *[Moscow TV]* 16

Northeast Asia

ROK Politician Gives News Conference in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 16

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Burmese Students Demand Reopening of Schools *[Moscow International]* 17
Burmese Talks With Karen Insurgents Advocated *[Vladimirov on Moscow International]* 18

Near East & South Asia

Cultural, Scientific Agreement Signed With Iraq *[TASS]* 18

Bessmertnykh Meets With PLO's 'Abbas 13 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 18
Afghan Opposition's 'Government' Criticized *[Surguchev on Moscow Radio]* 19
Improvement of Pakistani-Soviet Ties Urged *[Viktorov on Moscow International]* 20
Messages Exchanged on Jordanian Holiday *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 21

Sub-Saharan Africa

Reportage on Ethiopia's Eritrean Proposals 21
Peace Overtures to Separatists Welcomed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 21
Offer To Discuss Peace Initiatives Noted *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 22
Burundi Foreign Minister Arrives in Moscow 13 Jun *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 22
Holds Talks With Adamishin *[TASS]* 22
Primakov Receives Minister *[Moscow TV]* 23
Zimbabwean Party Delegation Ends USSR Visit *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 23
Benin Party Delegation Ends USSR Visit *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 23
Commentary on Spread of South African Violence *[Moscow International]* 23

East Europe

Text of 9 Jun USSR-GDR Joint Statement Published *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 24
GDR's Fischer Cited on Talks With Shevardnadze *[Moscow TV]* 26
Reburial Ceremony for Hungary's Nagy Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 26
Reform Proposals Submitted to Hungarian Assembly *[TASS]* 27
Hungarian Assembly Approves Halting of Dam Project *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jun]* 27
Correspondent Views Polish Election Results *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 28
Social Problems Continue in SFRY's Kosovo Province *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 29

West Europe

15 Jun Speeches by Gorbachev, Rau Published *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 29
PRAVDA Ponders Results of Gorbachev's Visit *[19 Jun]* 30
European Comment on Gorbachev's Bonn Visit Cited *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 32
Visit Called 'Landmark Event' in FRG-USSR Relations *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 32
'Majority' of FRG Citizens View USSR Favorably *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 12 Jun]* 34
FRG Company To Supply Computers to USSR *[TASS]* 35
USSR Ship 'Maksim Gorkiy' Hits Iceberg 19 Jun 36
All Passengers, Crew Rescued *[TASS]* 36
Cruise Ship 'Dangerously Listing' *[TASS]* 36
Paper Notes 'Successful' Polish-UK Talks in London *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jun]* 36
Greek Ambassador Presents Credentials to Lukyanov *[TASS]* 37
Soviet, Swiss Officials Meet in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 37
New Soviet-Portuguese Trade Plans Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jun]* 37
Sakharov Arrives in Netherlands 15 Jun *[TASS]* 38
Moscow-Supported Turkish Radio Ceases Broadcasts *[Istanbul HURRIYET 9 Jun]* 38

Latin America & Carribbean

Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Brazil 13-19 Jun 38
Brazil's Sarney Receives Vorotnikov *[TASS]* 38
Vorotnikov Visits Congress *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 38
Vorotnikov Addresses Congress *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 39
Vorotnikov Meets Businessmen *[TASS]* 43
Delegation Arrives in Rio De Janeiro *[TASS]* 44
Delegation Departs From Brazil *[TASS]* 44

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Casualties Reported in Kazakhstan Riots 16-17 Jun 45
'Rowdies' Rampage in Novyy Uzen *[Moscow Radio]* 45

3 Reported Dead, 53 Injured *[TASS]* 45
'Hooligan Outbursts' Reported *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 45
Continued Coverage of Crisis Events in Fergana 45
Indications of Impending Crisis *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 14 Jun]* 45
Uzbek Writer on Meskhetian Crisis *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 15 Jun]* 47
Social Causes of Unrest Noted *[TASS]* 48
Reasons for Violence Examined *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 49
Citizens Fear Renewed Violence *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 49
'Roots' of Fergana Tragedy Traced *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 50
Fergana Oblast 'Stabilizing' *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 51
Situation 'Returning to Normal' *[Moscow Radio]* 52
Social Problems Fueled Unrest *[Moscow Radio]* 52
'Situation in Fergana' 20 Jun *[TASS]* 53
Meskhetian Turks Demonstrate in Moscow 19 Jun *[Moscow International]* 53
Congress Resolution on Deputy Status Published *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 53
Trade Union Deputies Present Agenda to Congress *[TRUD 7 Jun]* 54
Deputies Interviewed on Congressional Proceedings 56
Alksnis on Credentials Panel Question *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 3 Jun]* 56
Primakov on New Position, Organization *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 56
Yeltsin, Vlasov Grant Postcongress Interviews 57
Yeltsin on Domestic, Mideast Issues *[Cairo AL-MUSAWWAR 16 Jun]* 57
Vlasov Foresees 'Show of Strength' by Right *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 18-19 Jun]* 61
CPSU Role in Postcongress Restructuring Examined *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 62
Article Criticizes Party's Ideological Work *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 64
Voters' Demands 'Complicated' Congress's Work *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Jun]* 67
Gdlyan, Ivanov Actions Prompt Paper's Rejoinder *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 69
Supreme Court Chairman Comments on Law Reform *[Moscow Radio]* 70
Estonian Delegate Assesses Gorbachev's Report *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 2 Jun]* 73
Estonian Deputies View First Week of Congress *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 1 Jun]* 74
Lithuania's Landsbergis Interviewed on Congress *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 1 Jun]* 75
Lithuanian Deputy Interviewed on Congress Factions *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 4 Jun]* 77
Lithuanian Rally Commemorates 1941 Deportations *[Vilnius Radio]* 78
Lithuanian Hunger Striker Wins Prisoner's Release *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 6 Jun]* 78
Rally for Latvian De-Stalinization Held in Riga *[Riga Radio]* 78
Calls for Sovereignty Reported *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 83
KGB Investigating Riga Association Fire *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 83
Tbilisi Paper Disclaims Editorial Cited by Rodionov *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 31 May]* 83
OGONEK Editor Asks 'Forgiveness' for Censorship *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 31 May]* 85
Academician Bromley Discusses Nationalities Issue *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 3 Jun]* 85
Continued Coverage of Bashkir Gas Pipeline Disaster 88
Train Disaster Casualties Updated *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Zaykov Visits Burn Clinic 14 Jun *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 89
Television Covers Zaykov Visit *[Moscow TV]* 89
Minister Interviewed on Catastrophe *[GUDOK 8 Jun]* 89
Recovery Work Described *[GUDOK 8 Jun]* 91
Causes of Disaster Discussed *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Jun]* 92
Gas Blast Termed Inevitable *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jun]* 94
Fire Breaks Out at Ufa Railroad Station 15 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 95
Locals Fear Accident at CW Destruction Plant *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 95
'Pamyat' Linked to French Rightist Le Pen *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 14 Jun]* 96
Official Confirms Arming of Aeroflot Crews *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 97

Economic

Economists, Deputies Address News Conference 16 Jun 97
Discuss 'Crisis Phenomena,' Reform *[TASS]* 97
Congress Debate Continues *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 97
Shmelev on Congress Economic Discussions *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 9 Jun]* 98

Agricultural

Change in Food Imports Policy Urged *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 4 Jun]* 99

Scientific

Correction to 'Mir' Program Costs, Shuttle Plans 101

Military

Possible Causes of MiG-29 Crash Noted *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Jun]* 101
Military Industry Conversion Viewed *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 102
Comparison of Yazov TASS Interview 103

Nuclear, Space Arms Talks Resume in Geneva

LD1906095489 Moscow TASS in English 0947 GMT 19 June 89

[Text] Geneva June 19 TASS—Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms resumed in Geneva today by a meeting of the delegations' heads Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin and Ambassador Richard Burt.

The agreement to resume these talks interrupted last November by the U.S. Administration change was reached by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker during their Moscow meeting last month.

Nazarkin on 50

Arms Reductions, ABM Treaty Link

LD1906195689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Report by correspondent V. Dmitriyev, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons began in Geneva today.

[Dmitriyev] The main task facing the delegations of the two countries working in this Swiss city is to prepare a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments. During the 10 rounds which have been held here joint drafts of the treaty, a protocol on inspections and three other documents have been drawn up.

There has been a break of over 7 months in the work, which the new U.S. Administration explained was due to the need for appropriate preparation for the next round. According to tradition, the talks are held alternately in the USSR and U.S. missions.

The heads of the delegations—Richard Burt, former U.S. ambassador to the FRG, and Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin, who headed the Soviet delegation at the disarmament talks in Geneva, met in the U.S. mission today. On Wednesday there will be a full meeting of the diplomats and military experts of the two sides at the USSR mission. [video shows Burt and Nazarkin meeting and two delegations seated across the table]

[Dmitriyev shown in conversation with Nazarkin outside building] There is still doubt that all apsects of the talks have importance and significance. But still, what are the delgations drawing most attention to?

[Nazarkin] I would like to name one of the main problems the problem of the link between a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments and the observance of the ABM Treaty. There is a basis for solving it. This is Washington's so-called formula. But I, of course, should name the problem of long-distance sea-based cruise missiles. This is an important part of the strategic arsenal, and it is not possible to solve the problem of strategic offensive armaments without solving this question.

[Dmitriyev] The attention of the world's press has been rivetted on the talks. The rapid conclusion of a treaty would open up prospects for mankind to enjoy a more stable and secure world.

Burt Confirmed Chief U.S. Arms Talks Negotiator

LD1506144989 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Text] Washington June 15 TASS—Richard Burt was confirmed by the U.S. Senate on Wednesday as both chief U.S. negotiator for strategic arms limitation talks and head of the U.S. delegation for U.S.-Soviet negotiations on space weapons control and nuclear arms cuts in Geneva.

Burt is a former U.S. ambassador to West Germany, who earlier served as director of the bureau of politico-military affairs at the State Department and assistant U.S. secretary of state for European affairs.

White House press secretary Marlin Fitzwater said at a briefing on Wednesday that President Bush had not yet approved instructions for the U.S. delegation for the negotiations [words indistinct] Fitzwater quoting well-informed circles, THE WASHINGTON POST reported, however, that the Bush administration would hardly put forward any new initiatives that would promote quick conclusion of Soviet-U.S. agreements on strategic weapons cuts.

According to these circles, none of the presently discussed probable changes in the U.S. stand will help overcome the fundamental differences remaining [words indistinct] suspended last November.

A high-ranking U.S. official noted that none of the major strategists advocated a compromise on the main problems causing differnces between the United States and the Soviet Union, including sea and air-based cruise missiles, and that the majority opposed any change in the U.S. stand as (?regards) ABM defences, THE WASHINGTON POST reported.

Bush Statement on Geneva Negotiations Reported

LD1906185289 Moscow TASS in English 1844 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Washington June 19 TASS—President George Bush made today a statement in connection with the start in Geneva of a regular round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

George Bush said that the objective of the United States at the talks which are being resumed after half a year's break, was to achieve verifiable agreements "that improve our security while enhancing stability and reducing the risk of war."

The President's written statement circulated by the White House, points out that of all the outstanding issues discussed at the Geneva talks, verification of compliance with the agreements worked out "may be the most complex." The head of the U.S. Administration said that the United States would propose "that the two sides make a special effort to agree on, and begin implementing as soon as possible, certain verification...measures." The statement expresses the hope that early agreement on such issues "will speed solution of outstanding issues, and give added momentum to the efforts of our two countries" so as to conclude a treaty on a 50-per cent cut in the arsenals of strategic nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States.

White House Spokesman Cited on Verification Issue
LD2006074889 Moscow TASS in English 0720 GMT 20 Jun 89

[By TASS correspondent Igor Ignatiev]

[Text] Washington June 20 TASS— The U.S. intention to discuss the compliance with existing agreements at the resumed Soviet-American Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms is a new approach to an old problem, according to White House deputy press secretary Roman Popadiuk.

Popadiuk read out Bush's statement on this matter. Journalists remained sceptical however and Popadiuk was asked whether the United States was going to make a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction of Soviet and American strategic weapons conditioned on the working out of the verification issue. He replied that despite concentrating on verification issues, the United States was also planning to discuss other aspects of the START treaty. He said that the United States did not want to set any preliminary conditions. At the same time, the White House spokesman did not rule out the possibility of acheving a preliminary agreement on verification procedures to complete the entire START treaty.

Some Washington experts fear that the U.S. intention to put emphasis on verification will complicate the talks.

James Rubin of the Washington Arms Control Association said that there were serious doubts as to the commitment of the Bush Administration to a START treaty.

Solton Warns Against Procrastination at Arms Talks
LD1906153389 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] Another round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons, suspended 7 months ago, has begun in Geneva. The two sides have resumed work on drafting a treaty on 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons which began under President Reagan and yielded tangible results. Now how will these negotiations proceed under the Bush administration? Yuriy Solton writes the following comments:

So far it's difficult to say anything definite about the United States' stand. We only know that the White House has carefully analyzed the outcome of the previous negotiations and that the U.S. delegation brought to Geneva a package of instructions given by President Bush. The rest can be guessed only with the help of leaks of information. This uncertainty has generated pessimism among some reviewers, including Soviets. An anonymous report that the United States will seek to carry out trial inspections of Soviet strategic weapons to be convinced of their being verifiable, prior to signing the treaty, has been assessed as Washington's intention to slow down the process of the talks in Geneva. As for the repeated assurances of President Bush and his aides that they are faithful to the Strategic Defense Initiative, also known as the Star Wars program, they have given rise to belief that the United States intends to torpedo the anti-ballistic missile treaty.

In the meantime, cuts in strategic offensive weapons will be impossible without observing the ABM Treaty in the shape it was signed in 1972. There are also reports on other underwater reefs in the United States' stand. But I'm not a supporter of such purely pessimistic prognostications. Under discussion in Geneva are complex issues concerning the foundations of security for both countries. They will have to eliminate several thousand powerful nuclear warheads with strategic delivery vehicles, and that is why hasty decisions, made with too little thought, are hardly advisable. The two sides are to coordinate limitations on long-range sea-based and air-based cruise missiles. They are to reach an agreement on keeping within the limits of the ABM Treaty for a certain period of time, and on verification measures.

But fundamental agreements have already been gained. They were stated in a joint Soviet-American communique, issued as a result of the December 1987 summit. It seems important to me that on the eve of another round of talks in Geneva, the White House declared that it would largely maintain continuity in regard to the Reagan administration policy. For its part, Moscow reiterated its willingness to resolve the remaining problems in a constructive spirit and seek to conclude work on the treaty as soon as possible. All this inspires hope for success at the talks in Geneva. However, it is essential to refrain from procrastinating the talks artificially, and prevent the speed of the arms race from becoming faster than the pace of the disarmament talks.

'Significant' Continuity in U.S. Arms Talks Stance
PM1906130589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Vitaliy Gan dispatch under the "Correspondent Comments" rubric: "Marked by Continuity?"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Jun—The White House decided to embark on the nuclear and space armaments talks with the USSR that resume on 19 June from the positions it inherited from the previous administration.

Speaking at a press conference today, White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater stated that enhancing stability and lessening the danger of the outbreak of war through verifiable reductions in both sides' strategic nuclear forces is the U.S. goal. "As is well known," he said, "it is our goal to reduce these forces by 50 percent. The previous administration left a superb foundation. Continuity will be evinced to a significant extent in the present administration's approach to these talks." Noting that Washington intends to continue studying the questions connected with the talks, Fitzwater stressed that the United States reserves the right to modify its position.

The White House spokesman recalled that back in January the President issued an instruction that an analysis of U.S. strategy at talks in the arms control sphere be carried out. In the last 2 weeks, according to him, Bush met with leading advisers to discuss all the questions under examination. A number of decisions were made which will serve as instructions to the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks. Fitzwater did not go into detail, saying only that delegation members will be setting out for Geneva with the intention of "holding serious talks and seeking considerable progress in achieving agreements."

Although outwardly the White House statement sounded pretty smooth, there immediately surfaced "reefs" reported by administration "senior officials" who did not wish to be named. What they said gave THE WASHNGTON POST cause to talk about "very major policy changes in the arms control sphere." What is involved here, then? The fact that, according to the newspaper, the administration has decided to defer the conclusion of a treaty on reducing strategic offensive arms until the United States has carried out "trial inspections" of Soviet weapons to ensure their "verifiability." These representatives cited the fact that the administration is still uncertain whether the United States is in a position to carry out effective verification of the Soviet side's fulfilment of already agreed provisions. According to one of them, such "trial inspections" of Soviet missiles could supply information that will enable the administration to "improve the treaty provisions before we reach the end of the talks.".

The references and reservations that accompanied the leak about a substantial change in Washington's approach to already approved provisions have been rightly adjudged here as an ill-diguised attempt to "slow down" the sides' progress toward a solution on this most important task—the reduction of strategic offensive arms. S. Kinney [name as transliterated], president of the Arms Control Association, described the White House decision as "disgraceful." "It seems that the Bush administration intends to destroy the prospects for completing the agreement drawn up under President Reagan which now lies within the bounds of the attainable." Kinney's arguments are weighty. How can one agree to "trial inspections" when there are no guarantees that the treaty will be concluded? Are we perhaps dealing with a dirty trick on the part of those bent on thwarting the talks?

Until the talks start, of course, all of this can be consigned to the realm of conjecture. The progress of the discussion will undoubtedly show what the American delegation has brought with it and the arguments it will be guided by.

SALT-II Anniversary, Arms Talks Resumption Noted
LD1806104989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 18 Jun 89

[Interview with commentator Andrey Ptashnikov, by unidentified correspondent; date, place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] An important date in the history of Soviet-U.S. relations, and in such a generally important matter for all humanity as nuclear disarmament, is remembered today. Exactly 10 years have passed since the day when the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty was signed between the USSR and the United States. I mean SALT II. We will dwell in more detail on this subject. My colleague, commentator Andrey Ptashnikov, will help me on this. Please.

[Ptashnikov] You will agree that 10 years is a very considerable period, especially in politics. Nevertheless I believe that many of you, comrades, remember that day in 1979. Soviet television on that occasion carried a live relay from Vienna where Leonid Brezhnev and U.S. President Carter ceremoniously signed the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of strategic weapons, which was given the name SALT II. It replaced the 1974 provisional agreement between the USSR and the United States on several measures in the sphere of limiting strategic offensive weapons, or SALT I. The new treaty established equal maximum levels of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles for both sides, in particular of ICBM's [intercontinental ballistic missiles], including those with MIRV's [multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles], and strategic bombers. In short, this document served the cause of stopping the arms race and took into account the interests of the USSR and the United States on the principles of equality and identical security.

[Correspondent] But, despite its importance and significance, the SALT II Treaty, as is well known, has not to this day been ratified by the United States.

[Ptashnikov] Yes, this is so. Nevertheless, for 7 years both sides fulfilled the obligations they had assumed and did not exceed the limits established by the treaty. However, the United States did try to do this on more than one occason, and finally, at the end of 1986, by bringing into operation the 131st strategic bomber, equipped with long-range cruise missiles, the White House thus unilaterally violated the treaty.

[Correspondent] Let us nevertheless return to today, first, because the situation in the sphere of disarmament has clearly improved recently. Second, because the USSR and the United States are now implementing the

treaty, signed by them, on medium- and shorter-range missiles. Moreover, the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, including the strategic arsenals of the two countries, are to resume in Geneva tomorrow.

[Ptashnikov] Note that this will take place following a 7-month break. Let me remind you that this break was caused by the regular U.S. presidential elections and the coming to power of a new administration.

[Correspondent] Nevertheless in my opinion the period of inaction on such an important matter has clearly been prolonged. After all, the Bush administration began to carry out its duties 4 months ago. [as heard]

[Ptashnikov] Nevertheless it has been completely unable to work out its position at the talks and as a result the date for their resumption has been postponed more than once. But now, finally, they are to start again tomorrow, and incidentally, not from scratch. The participants in the previous talks have already laid a solid foundation for the concluding of a new agreement on strategic weapons. In the draft document, about 400 pages long, the maximum ceilings on strategic delivery vehicles and weapons have in particular been agreed upon.

[Correspondent] Nevertheless, there are still enough unresolved questions.

[Ptashnikov] More than enough. Unfortunately, it is necessary to note that any important, constructive steps by the United States are not to be expected for the time being. In any case the White House announcement on the eve of the resumption of the Geneva talks bears witness to this very thing. It implies that the U.S. Administration has not yet made any flexible decisions on such key matters as sea-based cruise missiles and mobile land-based missiles. The White House has in addition confirmed its adherence to realizing the Strategic Defense Initiative.

[Correspondent] There are still many difficulties, but nevertheless we will hope that the day is not far off when we will witness the signing of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons. You will agree that the precondition for this exists.

NATO's Need To Modernize Arms Policy Stressed

18070313 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 4 Jun 89 p 3

[Commentary by political observer Vladlen Kuznetsov: "The Age of Maturity"]

[Text] The problems of disarmament have never before occupied as visible a place in East-West relations as they do today. Parallel negotiations are being held on several subjects at the same time: on conventional weapons and on chemical, strategic, and nuclear weapons. And what is especially important is that there are good chances for success. Hopes are also linked to the stimulating influence of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. And under these conditions, the USSR and other Warsaw Pact members propose to open one more channel of negotiations, on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

Those who apparently do not exclude war are attempting to assert their correctness in a tone which does not tolerate objections. "I do not see any circumstances in the future under which we can withdraw all nuclear weapons from Europe," Pentagon chief R. Cheney said. End of discussion. After all, this is how it is. Western Europe, it seems, must be forever riveted, as if chained, to American nuclear weapons, and its voice not taken into consideration. According to British Foreign Secretary G. Howe, entering into negotiations with the USSR, as the FRG demands, is "unwise". The East and West have "no common ground" for this. Then the question arises: What is wise? That American nuclear missiles are capable not so much of reaching the "potential adversary," the USSR, as they are of hitting the GDR, Poland, and Czechoslovakia? And how is it that the Warsaw Pact and NATO have "no common ground" if they want to avoid war in Europe? G. Howe should have said directly that the missiles must be kept farther away from the negotiating table so that no one gets the idea of asking at some stage whether it is time for London to join in disarmament and reduce its "independent" nuclear arsenal. It is correct to ask the same question of Paris as well.

For all these years NATO has been termed an alliance of equal, sovereign partners. But essentially only now are they beginning to speak in full voice, to boldly defend their lawful national interests. And that proved so unexpected for some that they are trying to pass off Bonn's manifest independence as some sort of "challenge" to the Atlantic alliance. They express bewilderment that the FRG chancellor put his country's national interests ahead of those of the United States and England in determining its international course and policy in the area of security. They are surprised that this time the "challenge" has been issued not by the "chief adversary," but from a trusted ally. But what is there really to be surprised about? It is high time for the FRG, an economically powerful state dynamically gathering political strength, to occupy its proper place both in NATO and beyond its own borders. And who, if not oneself, is to decide whether or not to have nuclear weapons on one's territory? This position, supported by the population and the Bundestag, merits all support.

The same cannot be said for the position of those who have not yet realized that the age of monopoly and unconditional leadership is passing. But this is exactly what Washington cannot accept. They are not yet ready to part with their superpower ways there. And in everything, they want to insist on their own way without fail, to keep their partners in the fetters of strategic dependence, under a regime of incomplete sovereignty. The

preservation of the prevailing positions in NATO is viewed as a counterbalance to an integrated Western Europe.

The current conflict in NATO also reflects the crisis in its "strategy of deterrence," the strategy of "flexible response," which envisages the use of nuclear weapons at the first stages of a military conflict and does not exclude inflicting a first strike. This strategy looks like a dinosaur against the background of the radically changing European and global landscape. The issue of exchanging the strategy, which is no longer in the interests of West European security, for the concept of the common, collective, partnership security of NATO and the Warsaw Pact is raised more and more frequently. And it is not by accident that in April, the FRG and Turkey interrupted NATO maneuvers in dispute of Washington's decision on the hypothetical use on their territories of battlefield nuclear weapons. It seems, however, that even this signal of acute anxiety was not perceived by the White House the way it should have been.

Such are the components of the conflict. But its deepest state of affairs and essence is in the issue of how to conduct affairs with the Soviet Union, which in 4 years has decisively and radically renewed both its foreign policy and its military activity and strategy. M. Thatcher does not stint in her compliments of the changes in the USSR. G. Bush also expresses his support for restructuring, even correcting his closest collaborators when they go too far in their pessimistic evaluation of the USSR's prospects. But compliments alone will not improve East-West relations nor strengthen their security. Good deeds must follow good words.

The acute contradictions in NATO did not arise through any fault on Moscow's part. It would have preferred that spears not be crossed within the Atlantic association in disputes about whether or not to enter a dialogue with the USSR on tactical nuclear weapons. The contradictions arose as a result of the fact that in NATO some think in a modern way and are beginning to regard the USSR without the former antagonism and preconceptions and are attempting to build relations with it on a new basis, while others have become fossilized in old positions of mistrust and temporizing. Here is what the English newspaper THE GUARDIAN writes: Where the Bush administration and the Thatcher government see an adversary, albeit a less dangerous one than in the past, the Kohl government views a potential partner."

Forty years is the age of maturity. Did the participants in the NATO anniversary session show this in Brussels 29-30 May? On the one hand, they undertook to get in step with the times, to respond to the appeals of the Warsaw Pact states to evaluate the new reality and end the "cold war," and to continue with efforts toward disarmament. In Washington they finally decided to stop keeping mum in the face of Soviet initiatives and to yield to their allies' numerous demands to take a more active position. Speaking in Brussels, President G. Bush formulated new proposals which, in his opinion, call for the radicalization and acceleration of the course of the Vienna talks on conventional disarmament from the Atlantic to the Urals. For the first time, combat aircraft and helicopters figure in these proposals. Up to this time, NATO had declined to include these in a reduction program, intending to preserve for itself unilateral superiority in these types of armaments. This time, there is a greater inclination toward reductions of personnel as well, to which the Western participants of the Vienna negotiations had previously objected. Finally G. Bush proposed collapsing the time frame for reductions to 6-12 months, giving some observers, however, cause to doubt that this is a realistic picture. G. Bush's proposals, which go further than the NATO draft introduced in March, undoubtedly deserve careful consideration.

Meanwhile, judging by appearances the dispute surrounding short-range nuclear weapons ended in a draw with a compromise. The U.S.-British variant for immediate modernization of the Lance missiles did not get through. The issue was tabled until 1992. On the other hand, Washington managed to block the majority's proposal to begin negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons immediately.

No one will ever manage to convince us that the rejection of such negotiations is the best answer. The East and the West now hold debates on all types of armaments, with the exception of reduced-size nuclear weapons. The absurd remains absurd, however much you insist on it. The participants of the Western alliance will have to sit down at the negotiating table sooner or later. THE NEW YORK TIMES states: "Even acknowledged hawks feel that it would be safe and wise to hold negotiations concurrent with the negotiations on conventional weapons." No one doubts NATO's ability to modernize weapons. The Atlantic community must prove something else—its ability to modernize its thinking.

UN Regional Conference on Disarmament Ends

LD1606181389 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 16 Jun 89

[By TASS correspondents Viktor Zhilyakov and Mikhail Svetlichny]

[Text] Dagomys (Krasnodar Territory) June 16 TASS—The U.N. regional conference which was held within the world disarmament campaign and sponsored by the U.N. Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Soviet Peace Committee, ended its work today. In the five days of the forum's deliberations in the resort city on the Black Sea, some 100 participants from Europe, the USA and Canada discussed 10 reports on such key issues of our times as nuclear disarmament under the conditions of the operation of the INF Treaty, security and disarmament in Europe and arms control.

U.N. Under-Secretary General Yasushi Akashi said that world nations are getting increasingly convinced that security is a universal conception and not a privilege of any one state. This idea was reflected in reports prepared by working groups of the conference, which say, among other things, of the need for an integrated approach to the problems of ensuring security, which would embrace all spheres of military, political, economic and humanitarian cooperation, of the importance of confidence-building measures which need to cover not only the military but also political, economic and humanitarian spheres.

"The international cooperation cannot be fruitful if partners see an enemy in each other," said Jan Kubis, counsellor of the Czechoslovak Embassy in Moscow. "The socialist countries stand out against the bloc structure in Europe and for pooling efforts on the construction of a 'European home'. People's diplomacy is acquiring great importance, as never before, in this connection." Many conference participants backed the idea of the need to strive for interaction between non-government organisations and diplomatic and military departments to reach agreements in the sphere of disarmament and support for operating treaties. They also spoke of the need to seek adoption of legislative acts which would juridically ensure a possibility for switching over the munitions industry to peaceful footing.

"The Soviet side regards all that has been accomplished for the time being in nuclear disarmament only as a start of serious work to bridle the arms race," said Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov. "Now it is especially important to ensure continuity of the disarmament process and to avoid artificial pauses and delays."

CEMA 1988 Economic Performance Statistics Reported
PM1406154789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[A. Borisov report under the rubric "Community": "Another Step Forward"]

[Text] Many PRAVDA readers are asking in their letters what economic results the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance member countries ended with in 1988.

Most fraternal states took another step forward in developing their economies in the 3d year of the current 5-year period. This is graphically borne out by the data on the basic results of their economic development in 1988 which were published in the May issue of the journal EKONOMICHESKOYE SOTRUDNICHESTVO STRANCHLENOV SEV:

[In the following table figures in columns two and three give "Growth rates (in percentages against the previous year)," and columns four and five indicate "For information puposes: average annual growth rates"; figures in all four columns are expressed "in comparable prices and in percentages"; according to a footnote, figures for exports and imports are expressed "in prices applicable to the corresponding years"]

	1987	1988	1981-1985	1986-1988
Produced national income	2.4	4.1	3.2	3.5
Industrial output	3.6	3.7	3.4	4.0
Labor productivity in industry	3.9	4.4	2.8	4.3
Agricultural output	-0.7	1.0	2.1	1.8
Capital investments	5.0	4.4	2.5	5.5
Exports	2.1	3.6	7.9	0.6
Imports	-0.8	4.1	7.2	0.2

The Bulgarian economy continued to develop at a high and stable rate. The produced national income in 1988 increased by almost 6.2 percent in comparison with the previous year.

Industrial goods output increased by 5.1 percent. The progressive changes in the national economy deepened, and the structure of the productive forces was improved. Capital investments for these purposes rose by almost 31 percent over 1987.

Plans in agriculture were not met. Around 63,000 apartments were commissioned in the country, but the state order for the construction of housing was underfulfilled by more than one-fifth.

In Hungary the situation was different. The main aim of 1988 here was to improve the economic balance and enhance production efficiency. However, the plan targets with respect to the main indicators were not fullfilled. An increase in gross output was achieved only in agriculture—4.5 percent. The debt in convertible currency increased, albeit slightly less than in 1987. In external trade Hungary achieved a balance totalling $573 million.

The heroic people of Vietnam are surmounting numerous difficulties. During the past year the first steps were taken in the republic to mobilize reserves in all spheres of the economy with a view to creating new jobs and stepping up economic activity. The gross social product increased by 5.4 percent, industrial performance improved, and the production of food crops increased by 8.5 percent. Still, complex problems remain unresolved. Inflation has risen. Unemployment is on the increase.

We will report on the development of other CEMA countries in 1988 in one of the next features under the "Community" rubric.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Explains Visa Policy
LD1606213189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1414 GMT 16 Jun 89

["USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman on Soviet Union's Visa Policy"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jun (TASS)—Restructuring has to a large extent affected the visa activity of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Igor Khalevinskiy, deputy head of the consular directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said today.

Speaking at a briefing here, he told journalists about the changes in the ministry's consular work, and particularly in the sphere of visas.

From the first months of restructuring the Soviet Union began to renounce many stereotypes in relation to foreigners and to alter its approach to our countrymen living abroad permanently, he said.

He noted that Soviet consular officials have seen it as one of their important tasks to carry out those points of the final document of the Vienna meeting which relate to consular work. There are three matters involved: simplifying visa procedures, widening the regime of repeated visas, and maximally using the no visa regime.

Last year, Igor Khalevinskiy continued, the USSR proposed that all West Europe countries should sign a uniform standard visa agreement providing for the radical simplication of visa procedures. That proposal is being discussed with a number of states. With some, practical consultations are already being held at the foreign minister level. The spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry noted that a need is being felt to work out standardized norms within the framework of the "Common European home," and expressed the view that it is desirable to convene a common European forum on consular matters at the level of experts.

Among other changes in the consular activity of the USSR Foreign Ministry, he mentioned the revival of the undeservedly forgotten institution of honorary consuls, which existed in the first years after the October Revolution, and the desire to develop travel between countries on a no visa basis.

European Forum on Humanitarian Cooperation Opens

USSR Emigration Statistics Given
18001213 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 10 Jun 89 p 7

[Dmitriy Yakushkin report: "A Policy of Humanism"]

[Text] Paris—The first of three planned meetings of the Conference on Humanitarian Cooperation within the framework of the European process began its work in Paris only a couple of days after the opening of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin. This fact alone demonstrated better than any words the processes that have begun and are developing within Soviet society—a society which quite recently was frequently the subject of hostile attacks at such international forums.

Different times are coming. In the words of the leader of the Soviet delegation, Ambassador at Large Yu. Kashlev, the situation at the Paris conference is significantly different from that which characterized the beginning of the Vienna meeting. The speeches are constructive and mutual criticism is no longer confrontational.

As we know, the agenda of the Paris meeting consists of three points: an analysis of how the agreements reached in Vienna are being fulfilled; a discussion of the effectiveness of the mechanism developed there for verifying these agreements; and, finally, suggestions for the future.

As concerns the Soviet Union, all the legislative work that is being undertaken these days meets not only the domestic needs, but also the international commitments it has made, particularly the Vienna agreements. A detailed press conference by the Soviet delegation showed that the West is attentively observing which laws the USSR intends to adopt and is interested in the concrete provisions of the future acts. One of them, for example, is of special interest. This is the future draft law concerning the policy for exit from and entry into the Soviet Union. It pertains directly to the Vienna agreements.

But, as the Soviets announced here, practice is outpacing legislation. Almost everyone who wants to leave now to take up permanent residence abroad has that opportunity. Thus during the first 4 months of 1989 the number of permits increased by a factor of 2.6 as compared to the same period last year. In 1988, 108,000 people left the Soviet Union for permanent residence abroad. This figure exceeds the analogous indicator for 1987 by a factor of 2.7 and for 1986 by a factor of 18. There are also rejections. But their number has decreased. Last year, for example, the number of rejections to Soviet citizens to travel abroad for private affairs was only 0.3 percent. Of those who applied for permission to leave for the purpose of permanent residence abroad 1.1 percent were refused. The main reason for rejection was the possession of state secrets.

Changes are also taking place in solving problems of temporary trips, family reunions, and the accommodation of tourists and school children. Thus internal restructuring in the USSR removes from the agenda entire areas of discussion which previously evoked turbulent disputes. Mutually acceptable solutions are now being sought in a calm and constructive atmosphere. Such multilateral conferences as the one now being held in Paris contribute to this. And also bilateral contacts in the area of human relations that meet the requirements of the Vienna meeting. For example, the USSR and the United States are organizing roundtable discussions with the participation of theoretical and practical lawyers in

order to compare legislation, learn about the activity of the courts and procurators' offices, and visit corrective labor institutions. There was an exchange of visits of psychiatrists who had the opportunity to directly study the illnesses of patients who specifically interested them. Similar contacts are being developed with other countries.

In the final analysis the discussion at the Paris conference brings us closer to such a concept as "European legal space." The French delegation gives it a different name—the "European legal state"—but in both cases they are referring to developing a common understanding of legal principles and norms.

"There is no doubt that each country establishes its own rules by which its citizens live," I was told by an eminent French specialist in the area of law, the director of the Institute of Comparative Legal Research, Michel Lesage. "But if the distance between these sets of rules is great the people get the feeling that they are dealing not with people like themselves but with some alien subjects who are guided by different laws in daily life. We are speaking not about copying one another's laws but about developing them in the same direction and making our differences in the area of law mutually acceptable."

USSR, France Seek 'Common Legal Space'

PM2006083889 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko report: "A Common Legal Space in Europe"]

[Text] Paris—At the conference on the human dimension of the all-European process that is taking place in Paris, the Soviet and French delegations have put forward a joint proposal on turning Europe into a common legal space, based on a community of rule-of-law states.

The Soviet-French initiative envisages as the first steps the carrying out of a comparative study, within the CSCE framework, of the legislation, administrative rules, and judicial practice, as well as parliamentary, executive, and judicial institutions of the participating states, and a quest for areas in which it would be possible to begin the formulation or codification of common legal norms. Furthermore the Soviet Union, France, and a number of other countries came out in favor of the formation of a center for comparative analysis of legislation in the human rights sphere in Europe.

"The concept of a common legal space must be filled with real content," Special Ambassador Yu.B. Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation at the Paris conference, stated at a meeting with journalists. "This proposal is based on the concept of the common European home. We want the legal norms that exist within this home to be the same for everyone and of the highest standards. We regard the creation of a common legal space as a long-term process consisting of several stages. In all European countries international commitments and legal norms should have the same force, and, finally, the questions arising from this concept should be resolved in practice, without delay. At the same time we do not conceive of the common legal space as a renunciation of sovereignty, of one's own sociopolitical system, or of national borders. We call on all 35 states that signed the Final Act to move in this direction."

In our country we take a very concrete approach to this problem, V.F. Yakovlev, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Soviet Legislation, stressed at the press conference. Our institute is involved with the drawing up of international legal acts concerning human rights and with internal legislation, with a view to improving and democratizing it and achieving full compliance with international commitments and standards.

Furthermore, the Soviet delegation submitted at the conference a proposal on the further humanization of the sphere of consular relations and the holding of a special all-European forum on these problems.

A feature of the Paris meeting is the active participation of numerous representatives of international and national nongovernmental organizations. "The public can and should be more actively involved in the quest for new forms of all-European cooperation," V.V. Tereshkova, chairman of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, stated at the conference.

The Paris conference is discussing the fulfillment of the accords reached in Vienna in the sphere of human rights and humanitarian cooperation. It will end on 23 June.

United States & Canada

U.S. Federal Election Commission Visits USSR

PM1606093589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Article by A. Lyutyy: "But How Do They Do It?"]

[Text] The U.S. Federal Election Commission (FEC) has frequently given the U.S. press food for sensation. For instance, this control organ which monitors the observance of laws during campaigns for the election of the president, vice president, and members of Congress, recently fined Texan Republican Senator Phil Gramm $30,000 for concealing information about election campaign donations. Not long before that there was a showdown with the religious preacher Pat Robertson, who was running for president.

In the past few days, however, it is not the FEC's inspectors but the FEC itself which has caused a sensation. For the first time in the 15 years it has existed, the entire commission traveled abroad. And not just anywhere, but to the Soviet Union. The Central Electoral Commission for the elections of USSR people's deputies was its host.

Although the competence of our organ is broader (the Central Electoral Commission basically deals with laws on financing elections), there were more than enough topics for dialogue. At the meeting with A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in talks with people's deputies, and in contacts with local organs of power there was talk about how mutually to enrich each other with experience and make the mechanism of voting in each country simpler, more accessible and effective while minimizing possible violations.

"Our talks," FEC Chairman Danny McDonald summed up, "were frank and very full. We believe that we can with benefit to both sides exchange information and opinions on questions like the registration of voters, access to polling stations, control over voting, and the prevention of cheating with the ballot papers."

Last year, at the height of the Congressional elections, a delegation from the Central Electoral Commission arrived in the United States at the invitation of the FEC. And the Americans visited us at the very height of the Congress of People's Deputies.

"Although we were only in the Kremlin's Palace of Congresses for a very short time, we nonetheless noted how active and frank the speakers were," D. McDonald confided. "We were pleasantly struck by the fact that the auditorium was filled to overflowing; that seldom happens in our country. Do U.S. legislators call each other 'demagogues?' It does happen, although I cannot say we like it. Are the speakers 'slow handclapped?' No, anyone who greatly dislikes a speech by his colleague simply leaves the auditorium."

Actually, McDonald believes, every country fine tunes the parliamentary mechanism in its own way. For instance, the Americans were surprised that our Central Electoral Commission manages with a very modest staff, while the FEC, which is engaged in a far narrower range of questions, has an apparatus of 250 people and does not regard this as a bureaucratic excess.

Since talk has turned to the FEC's structure, I shall report in conclusion that it was formed after the Watergate scandal in 1974 and has been given independent status. It has a staff of six—three Democrats and three Republicans. They are appointed by the president for a 6-year term and are approved by the U.S. Senate. The budget is assigned from federal funds, and this year it was $15.4 million. The FEC meets twice a week, and anyone who wants can attend its sittings. It regularly publishes press releases and information about the election expenses of any candidate for the country's high elected offices. Those who want to address a question, proposal, or complaint to the commission can telephone a "hotline" from anywhere in the United States. The FEC pays for international conversations.

Commentator Hopes U.S. Lifts Trade Restrictions

LD1706092989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Excerpts] A draft resolution has been submitted to the U.S. Congress. It asks the White House to remove the discriminatory trade restrictions on the USSR. Here is a latest news commentary. Andrey Ptashnikov is at the microphone.

[Ptashnikov] The authors of the draft resolution in question are Downey and Moynihan, two congressmen who are Democrats from New York. It is extremely difficult to suspect either of them, especially the latter, of liking our country. It is obvious, however that political flair cannot be denied them. It has been suggested to them that the time has come to raise the question of abolishing the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, adopted by the U.S. Congress in 1974. Let me remind you that it deprives the USSR of the most-favored nation trade status with the United States and erects insurmountable barriers to trade development. This has caused the volume of USSR-U.S. trade to fall steadily, eventually reaching a ridiculously low level. It is currently equivalent to the trade turnover between the United States and Denmark.

At some point in the last 18 months, naturally in response to Soviet restructuring, the United States has begun to show ever greater interest in invigorating bilateral trade and economic relations. I am far from the thought that American businesses have decided to help us cope with our complex problems. It is just that these businesses have quickly sensed the prospects opening up for advantageous capital investment. [passage omitted]

The U.S. allies, among other nations, insist on expanding economic ties with the USSR. Thus, the House of Commons Committee for Trade and Industry has adopted a resolution to immediately and radically reduce the number of bans on East-West trade. In the course of Comrade Gorbachev's FRG visit which has just ended, a number of agreements were concluded, the implementation of which will lead to a considerable invigoration of bilateral economic relations. American businesses have realized at once that others are getting to the business ahead of them.

I think it is not fortuitous that Downey and Moynihan have submitted the draft of their resolution the day after appropriate USSR-FRG documents were signed in Bonn. The resolution has already been supported by many U.S. congressmen, including majority leaders in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Congress is expected to consider this issue in the near future. One is only left to hope that it will be resolved positively and that our two countries will, on the basis of mutual benefit, finally reach a worthy level of trade.

Commentator Views U.S. Middle East Policy

LD1606175289 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1400 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Aleksey Zlatorunskiy commentary: "The Soviet Union and the United States—A New Position on a Settlement of the Middle East Problem"]

[Text] In accordance with the agreement reached during the visit by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker to the Soviet Union last May, Soviet-U.S. consultations at expert level are being held in Washington these days over the problem of a settlement in the Middle East.

The Soviet delegation is headed by Vladimir Polyakov, chief of the Near East and North Africa desk at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, while the U.S. delegation includes (Kenneth Rust), head of the (?Policy Planning Office) at the State Department, and John Kelly, assistant to the secretary of state for Middle East and Asia Affairs.

During James Baker's visit to Moscow and his talks with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, and other statesmen, there was a deep study of the problem of settling conflicts, including the crisis of the Middle East. The final documents released on the visit of the U.S. secretary of state said that there are real opportunities for practical cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in finding just solutions by political means. The theory put forward by Eduard Shevarnadze during his visit to the Middle East, which says that the region should pass from confrontation and conflict between the two superpowers to cooperation in finding ways leading to a strong and lasting peace was also proven correct.

But one must not overlook that there are many obstacles to overcome on this road. At present there are three concepts of a settlement in the Middle East: those of the Soviet Union, the United States, and the Arab countries. The Arab position was clearly formulated during the recent Casablanca Arab summit. However, all of these concepts have a common feature: They reflect the desire to resolve the Middle East conflict politically. But there are also essential differences, and as a matter of fact, when one speaks about differences, it would be fair to think about just two concepts, for the concepts of the Soviet Union and the Arab countries on a settlement to the Middle East problem are not practically different from one another.

But what is the difference between Washington's position to the other one which we will call the Soviet-Arab position? Dr Clovis Maqsud, permanent delegate of the Arab League to the United Nations has said of the U.S. position on a solution to the Middle East problem that it is ambiguous, and I believe that there are grounds for this: Effectively, on the one hand, the U.S. Administration has taken the step of direct dialogue with the PLO representatives, and on the other hand it denies this organization any role in the settlement process. Likewise, Washington has on the one hand abandoned its opposition to the convening of an international conference on the Middle East under United Nations sponsorship, and on the other hand, it strongly defends the Shamir plan which was rejected by the Arabs and the international community because it is aimed at annexing the occupied Arab territories, and includes the ingredients of a fresh tension in the situation in the Middle East. Furthermore, officials of the U.S. Administration, including President George Bush, denounce the acts of terror practised by Israel in the occupied territories, in the form of killings, mass arrests, and expulsion of Palestinians, and on the other hand, the U.S. delegate to the security council insistingly resorts to the right of veto whenever there is a draft resolution condemning Israeli terror.

There are many such examples of Washington's confusion, regrettably, but the decision to hold regular Soviet-U.S. consultations over the question of the Middle East was taken in order to pursue a lasting and patient search for ways of a political settlement of this problem on the basis of balanced interests, and before all the interests of the direct parties to the conflict.

U.S. Arms Sales to Near East Criticized

PM1506101789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jun 89 Single Edition p 3

[V. Vladimirov "Military-Political Commentary": "It's Not Weapons That Are Needed"]

[Text] The Pentagon has declared its intention to sell large consignments of weapons to a number of Near and Middle East countries. DEFENSE NEWS announced that, in accordance with these plans, Saudi Arabia will

receive $500 million worth of U.S. arms. The shipments will include air-launched missiles and equipment for the U.S. F-15 fighters already in service with the Saudi Air Force. It is planned to sell a consignment of multiple rocket launchers and munitions for them worth almost $100 million to another Persian Gulf state—Bahrain. Egypt will receive $50 million worth of U.S. arms, including 150 Hawk antiaircraft missiles.

It cannot be denied that arms shipments worth $650 million at a stroke are no laughing matter. To an area, moreover, in which, on the one hand, Iran-Iraq relations have still not fully normalized after many years of hostilities and, on the other, the fuse of the Near East conflict is still smoldering, threatening at any moment to flare up into a full-scale war. Under these conditions increasing major arms shipments to this region, as Washington wants to do, means appreciably complicating the situation and helping preserve and even kindle tension there.

In announcing these shipments the U.S. side is trying to present them as a manifestation of its "balanced" course on the Near East. They say that it is not only Israel but also the Arabs that receive arms from Washington. First, however, it would be better for the establishment of peace and stability in the region if the United States did not supply arms to anyone at all. And, second, having announced its plans for new military shipments to Arab countries, Washington is still supplying Israel.

U.S. military and economic aid to its Near East "strategic ally" over the last few years has been held unremittingly right at the astronomical level of $4 billion per year. And if changes in this figure are to be expected in the immediate future, then it can only be in the form of an increase. Because the Pentagon has already embarked on handing over an additional consignment of 75 of the latest F-16 fighter-bomber modification to the Israeli Air Force, along with a large quantity of air-launched missiles for them.

In receiving so many weapons the Israeli Army does not just keep hoarding them but carries out regular maneuvers in order to master them better. Thus, major Israeli Armed Forces' exercises are now under way in the environs of Tel Aviv. Although no official statement has been issued about the scale and purpose of these exercises, agencies report that the Israeli troops involved are trying out the missiles and other arms obtained from the United States. The Negev Desert in northern Israel was the scene of other major maneuvers at the end of May. The ground forces and aircraft involved then rehearsed operations to overcome an enemy's reinforced defense areas by force, once again using U.S. weapons.

Thus, the United States does not have a "balanced" approach toward the Near East region. Israel still enjoys most-favored-nation status in Washington. It is Tel Aviv that receives the lion's share of the U.S. arms sent to the Near East. And how many times have these weapons already been used in bloody conflicts! No, it is not aircraft, tanks, missiles, and weapons that the Near East needs. But a sober and well-considered approach to its problems and a common desire to seek the solution of the conflict there in order to establish a just, lasting, and protracted peace in the interests of all sides.

'Offensive' Nature of 'Global Shield-89' Viewed

18010709 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by Colonel A. Alekseyev: "Global Shield-89; A Militaristic Rehearsal"]

[Text] Last month marked the occasion of major Pentagon operational and combat training measures of the American armed forces. It was an exercise of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) of the United States Air Force [USAF] under the code name "Global Shield-89." Exercises of this type have been held annually since 1979. They encompass the North American continent, the Arctic regions, Western Europe, and zones of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans.

The global span of these exercises, which is accurately described in the name ("Global Shield"), and their offensive direction are determined not only by geographic factors, but also by SAC-designated objectives, make-up of participants, level of leadership, and features of the combat training tasks that were developed. The Strategic Air Command was established in March of 1946 as a specified command a year before the creation of the USAF. Its mission was defined as the preparation for and the conduct of offensive operations on a global scale independently and in coordination with the ground forces and the VMS [Navy], the execution of strategic air reconnaissance on continental and ocean TVD's [theaters of military operations], and providing capabilities for the conduct of operations employing the newest types of weapons. The first steps in the integration of nuclear weapons into military plans are associated with this command.

At the present time, USAF SAC combines two components of the offensive forces—ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (MBR) [ICBM] and strategic bomber, reconnaissance, and refuelling tanker aviation. About 70 percent of the carriers and 55 percent of the nuclear warheads of the American strategic nuclear capability come under SAC. SAC's combat strength numbers about 1,000 "MX" and "Minuteman" ICBMs, 423 heavy (B-1B, B-52G, and B-52H), and medium (FB-111) bombers, 68 reconnaissance aircraft, 569 refuelling tankers, and 44 airborne command posts.

According to official reports of the U.S. Department of Defense, the main objectives of the "Global Shield" exercises are to verify the readiness of the command and control of SAC large strategic formations [obyedineniye], large units [soyedineniye], and units [chast] in the resolution of combat tasking missions and also in the development of plans for their employment in nuclear

war in coordination with other arms of the armed forces and commands. Under conditions that approximate combat as much as possible, the SAC command from year to year persistently improves the organization of the employment of subordinate groupings at the initiation and during the course of all-out nuclear war. It should be emphasized that plans for the combat employment of the forces and means of USAF SAC are a component part of the "Single Integrated Operations Plan for the Destruction of Strategic Targets" (SIOP). This basic strategic planning document which is worked up in accordance with the political directions of the U.S. administration under the direct management of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (KNSh) envisions numerous versions of delivering massive, selective, limited or regional strikes in preemptive and retaliatory-meeting actions. The overwhelming mass of targets planned for destruction are on the territory of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community.

American regulations and statements by highly-placed military figures have reservations on the inevitability of a transition to the employment of nuclear weapons in the course of combat actions. They state that the United States can resort to the use of nuclear weapons if "deterrence in support of national policy will not work." The initiation of nuclear war, which threatens all humanity with a catastrophe, is posited depending on national objectives, national policy, and the national military strategy of only one country.

Another condition also puts one on guard. Organs of command and control and contingents of other commands and branches of the armed forces of the United States are brought into the "Global Shield" exercises against a single operational-strategic background, first and foremost, the Navy and the USAF (Tactical Air Command, Military Air Transport Command, Air Training Command, and research and development, logistics, communications, security and REB [EW] commands, and the USAF in the zone of Alaska), USAF reserve components, and large formations of air and space defense of the North American continent (NORAD), and others. None of the representatives of the countries allied with the United States, except Canada, is allowed to become familiar with the plan and observe the course of the "Global Shield" exercises. They are conducted in a situation of special secrecy.

Practicing coordination constitutes an integral element of many military exercises. However, when one strategic command coordinates its large-scale measures with other large formations that possess nuclear weapons, the suspicion cannot help creeping in that, under the cover of a formal SAC exercise, the use of strategic, operational tactical, and tactical nuclear weapons is being played according to a single concept and plan. If this is the case, then "Global Shield" must be considered a rehearsal for all-out nuclear war.

An exercise scenario is worked up ahead of time and, according to statements of representatives of the U.S. military command, irrespective of the current military-political situation in the world. There is a simulation of a sharp increase in international tensions, the development of a crisis situation, an escalation of armed conflict into a conventional war, and, afterwards, escalation to nuclear war. According to this training background, the tasks of the transition of SAC forces and means to an increased state of combat readiness, the deployment of combat command and control systems, and the dispersal of strategic aircraft to alternate airfields and civilian airfields are worked out in stages. A check is made on capabilities for the employment of bomber units with conventional weapons in the interests of supporting general purpose forces in continental and ocean (sea) theaters of military operations, transition to the use of nuclear weapons, the elimination of the aftereffects of a nuclear strike exchange with the "enemy," and the reconstitution of the combat capability of forces and systems. The culminating point of exercises usually becomes the deployment of airborne command posts, a massive takeoff of strategic aircraft (it was this way in the 1987 exercise when up to 300 aircraft got into the air in the course of 10 minutes), and the start of the bombers on the combat patrol flight route in the direction of the borders of the USSR. A sketch from an American publication shows these "hypothetical corridors."

In the process of the active phase of the "Gold Shield" exercise, the combat crews at command and control centers of ICBM launch sites conduct specialized training and, at the moment of the massive takeoff of aircraft, they simulate missile launch operations. The history of the exercises is rich with combat training ICBM launches, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and antiship missiles, and practice bombing at target ranges, with a preliminary run to penetrate "enemy" PVO [air defense].

In addition to these exercises, SAC bombers conduct flights in accordance with plans of other exercises being conducted simultaneously with "Global Shield," including the NATO OVS [combined armed forces] "Palmainex" in the Mediterranean Sea, operating from the forward airfield at Moron (Spain). The bombers also simulate air assaults of the "enemy" on the North American continent, and the forces and systems of NORAD PVO intensively work out their tasks within the framework of the "Amalgam Chief" exercises. Aircraft of the 48th Heavy Bomber Air Wing (Andersen Air Force Base on the Island of Guam) at the same time demonstrate support of the treaty obligations of the United States of "mutual defense" with Japan and South Korea.

The effectiveness of the command and control systems are carefully evaluated, first and foremost, the timely and reliable notification on the employment of nuclear weapons. Several years ago, the American press described how the special "Red Team" command tested

the stability of elements of this system by simulating the disablement of a command and control site and signals systems by performing jamming. The training situation was saturated with scenario instructions on natural disasters, terrorist actions, and sabotage, etc.

We note in conclusion: The American command authority is overly modest, passing off the comprehensive, versatile "Global Shield" exercise, which is offensive in nature, as some kind of a shield. It is not an abstract aggressor, but specifically the United States that has declared whole regions of the world to be a sphere of their "vital interests" and, in the name of global ambitions, they are still trying to brandish the "nuclear club," not taking into account the dictates of the time in which we live.

China

Li Peng Remarks to Beijing Authorities Cited

PM1606101189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Situation Getting Back to Normal"]

[Text] Beijing, 13 Jun—The CPC Central Committee and the PRC State Council held a conference today with the leaders of the Chinese capital's departments and establishments at which Qiao Shi, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee, conveyed to those present the speech made by Deng Xiaoping at the meeting of the Chinese leadership with the command of the troops safeguarding martial law in Beijing. According to Chinese television, important speeches were delivered at the conference by Li Peng, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and premier of the PRC State Council, and Yao Yilin, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and deputy premier of the PRC State Council.

The head of the Chinese Government said that in his speech Deng Xiaoping analyzed the counterrevolutionary revolt, which threatened to spread right across the country, confirmed the correctness of the measures taken by the CPC and the PRC State Council to eliminate it, and stressed that the party's policy of reform and broadening ties with the outside world remain unchanged.

The premier drew attention to the need to restore order and strike a decisive blow against the rebels. At present the situation is stabilizing on the whole, he said.

Li Peng also indicated the importance of continuing the course of improving the economic situation, bringing order to the national economy, and deepening the reform. The leader of the PRC Government stressed that the revolt has done considerable damage to the country's national economy. He demanded that a determined struggle be waged against corruption and bureaucracy in party and state institutions.

As a result of the fact that some leaders in the CPC Central Committee made mistakes in their leadership of the mass media and lost touch with the party platform, a number of newspapers and journals have falsely depicted the way in which the counterrevolutionary revolt was put down, Li Peng pointed out.

In the sphere of foreign policy, the premier said, China will continue to follow the principle of sovereignty and independence and will continue its policy of broadening ties with the outside world.

The Chinese press has also carried information on meetings between a number of the country's party and state leaders and People's Liberation Army servicemen. On behalf of the CPC Central Committee, Qiao Shi urged troops to "make a new contribution to fully restoring public order in the capital."

According to XINHUA, the police are still searching for the organizers of the recent riots. A series of official documents order the "immediate disbandment" of illegal organizations, including the "united self-governing union of Beijing citizens," the "united union of the capital's intelligentsia," and the "committee for the protection of the constitution by patriots from all strata of the Beijing public." The press has reported that seven illegal organizations in Xi'an have been broken up and also that participants in the riots in the city of Shijiazhuang have been arrested.

The central government is still receiving telegrams of support for the measures it has taken from the leaders of the country's provinces and autonomous regions.

According to Zheng Tuobin, PRC minister of foreign economic relations and trade, foreign businessmen and managers of joint ventures who left China at the beginning of last week are now returning.

The chairman of the Chinese Olympics Committee has confirmed that China is ready to hold the Asian Games in Beijing in 1990.

USSR Ambassador to China Holds Talks With Jiyun

PM1606094789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

["IZVESTIYA Press Service" report under the general heading: "Order Returns to the City"]

[Text] News agencies are continuing to comment on the situation in China and are giving wide coverage to world reaction to the well known events in Tiananmen Square.

According to a statement by Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs J. Clark, his country has recalled its ambassador from Beijing for consultations, thus expressing its "condemnation of Chinese officials' actions."

The participants in an EEC Council of Ministers session in Luxembourg said that in the present circumstances it is not possible to maintain "normal relations" with the PRC.

It is reported that Zhongnanhai—the Forbidden City—the ancient imperial palace situated in Tiananmen Square, is again open to visitors and bicycles are allowed to pass through the square, where there are still tanks and infantry combat vehicles.

In Beijing, TASS reports, there was a meeting between USSR Ambassador to the PRC O.A. Troyanovskiy and Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and deputy premier of the PRC State Council. The Soviet representative was informed of the current situation in China. There was also a discussion of questions connected with expanding economic, scientific-technical, and trade cooperation between the two countries.

PRC Spokesman Comments on Zhao Ziyang Situation
LD1706111189 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] Beijing June 17 TASS—Speaking in an interview with NBC television, Chinese spokesman Yuan Mu raised the issue of the situation in the Chinese top leadership.

The XINHUA news agency reported that in an answer to question if Zhao Ziyang had been removed from the post of general secretary of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and if the party had a new leader, Yuan Mu said: "The recent meeting of Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping with leaders of the troops enforcing martial law showed the stability of the Chinese leadership to the entire world. It is true that certain people in the top leadership were misled in supporting the uprising." According to Yuan Mu, "The problem will be soon dealt with and made public."

Asked if Zhao Ziyang would be put on trial, the spokesman replied: "The problem is one within the party and will be dealt with according to the party's rules."

Economy Viewed; 'Two Essences' Policy Described
PM1906102789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "China: Guarantees Promised for Businessmen and Tourists"]

[Text] Beijing—Transport and communications in China's main cities are in principle working normally. We have frequently reported to readers on the situation in Beijing and two problems have appeared here now: Public transport stops operating early and there is a shortage of buses (60 were burned and about 200 are considerably damaged). Favorable news is also coming in from other cities.

In Wuhan, for instance, representatives of the municipal government stated at a meeting with foreign specialists that when the disorders spread from Beijing to Wuhan and traffic along the Great Bridge crossing the Yangzi river was blocked for several days, production and people's normal life were disrupted. Now everything is normal and we are prepared as before to encourage foreign investments and guarantee their security. Fragmentary reports on the return of foreign businessmen to China are appearing in newspapers and radio and television news programs. But so far there is no complete picture.

The tourist situation is far clearer. The majority of hotels "remain as empty as in the low season," which is striking severe blows to tourism and the services sphere. The state tourist administration has issued a statement signed by State Council Vice Premier Wu Xueqian which says that foreign tourists' tour itineraries are guaranteed, as is their personal safety. It is reported that normal life has returned to Beijing, Xian, Shanghai, Guangzhou, and other tourist centers. In particular the martial law in Beijing is not reflected in the entertainments program for tourists, even at night.

Yet the overwhelming majority of Beijing's large hotels are only 5 percent full. That is the lowest level for the years of "open policy." There is now talk of whether they can survive. Investments in many "luxury" hotels are now about 200 million yuan. And every year the hotels must pay up to 30 million yan on maintenance and loan interest.

According to the figures of the Beijing municipal government the direct economic loss from the disorders in the city over the past 2 months is over 1 billion yuan (the information is incomplete). The 4 days' closure of the city's four main department stores entailed losses of 10 million yuan and the chaos on the railroad in May and the first 10 days of June led to the loss of 25 million yuan. The statistics from the foreign trade department show a reduction in exports of 26 million yuan and some contracts have been cancelled and talks have been suspended. Agricultural production suffered great losses, but industry has record losses—700 million yuan.

Reports have arrived of a return to normal life in Shanghai, a very large industrial center. The city's vegetable markets are full again. Traffic has opened on all 130 highways and it is possible to stop a taxi even at night. All enterprises are working (in the first days of June the cost of gross output fell 22 percent compared with the same period last year). The Shanghai branch of the Bank of China has announced its full responsibility for the interests of investors, confirming that currency reserves are entirely adequate. The resumption of classes is harder: Only a few of Shanghai's universities and colleges can so far boast of having done that.

Incidentally, the State Commission for Education has reported that in the majority of the country's higher education institutions the number of students returning

to the lecture halls is slowly increasing, which cannot be said of the Beijing higher education institutions. According to some figures over 350,000 students from other cities dropped their classes at various times to join in the demonstrations in Beijing. The State Commission for Education has issued another appeal to end to boycotting of classes. Stern disciplinary sanctions and even legal penalties await those who do not return to the lecture halls. The state is absolving itself of the duty to find work for those graduates who do not fulfill these requirements. They will in fact be expelled from the higher education institutions.

The process of a return to normal life and of the realization and assessment of what has happened is a difficult one. As an editorial in the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO notes, production is being restored, transport is returning to normal, but it is far more difficult to reach unanimous opinions. There is still a great deal that is unclear and there is much confusion in people's minds. The newspaper calls on society to study seriously Deng Xiaoping's 9 June speech to the command of the troops backing up martial law in Beijing. In the newspaper's view this is a program document on whose basis it is possible to reach unanimous views. In future, RENMIN RIBAO notes, China must follow the line of "one center" and "two essences." What is "one center?" The party and the people must concentrate their efforts on work to modernize the country. What are the "two essences?" First, there is adherence to four basic principles: the socialist path, the leadership of the Communist Party, the democratic dictatorship of the people, and Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Zedong. Second, there is adherence to the policy of reforms and openness to the world. The newspapers call for ideological unity for the sake of building a strong democratic, civilized, socialist, and modernized China.

Assessing the recent events in Beijing, RENMIN RIBAO notes: If the CPC and the Chinese Government had displayed weakness or had embarked on compromise, the PRC, for whose sake countless sacrifices have been made, would have been swept away in an instant. The achievements of socialist building over 40 years of the people's power and the results of the decade of the policy of reforms would also have been destroyed.

Beijing Situation 'Returning to Normal'

LD1706195589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Kulikov in Beijing; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The situation in Beijing is returning to normal. Enterprises and offices are working. Soviet establishments in Beijing are also functioning normally—the Soviet Embassy, trade missions, and the consulate. Even during the difficult days of the June events their work went on uninterrupted. Soviet students are returning, having completed their studies in China. Some undergraduates and postgraduates are remaining in the PRC to prepare for their exams and some of them for their vacation.

Public transport is running; the markets are bustling; the stream of cyclists on the streets has increased. As usual, the kids of Beijing are at the center of attention—these true hosts and heroes of Beijing's alleyways.

But regarding the heroes on the television screens—the television has now become the country's main source of information—the main protagonist at the moment is the man with the rifle.

China's leaders, who have gathered in Beijing for a conference, have been talking about those soldiers who died this June. Members of the public lay wreaths at the sites of the most intense fighting. The country's prominent figures are visiting wounded soldiers in the hospital. Martial law is being maintained in the city and, of course, the domestic political, economic, and social problems are more complicated than the outward signs of normalization.

These pictures from Beijing TV appeal to the viewers' civic conscience. Active participants in the disturbances are being sought; their distinguishing marks are being reported, including their way of walking and the dialect they speak. Most of those being sought are students and postgraduates at Beijing's colleges who, judging by these pictures shot with a concealed camera, had long been under surveillance. Any of them who are found can expect to be detained, investigated, and punished.

There are several other problems on the agenda: economic, social, and ideological problems that are the purely domestic affair of the PRC. The economy has been frozen as it were, for some time, and now the country is taking stock of the losses. Li Peng premier of the state Council, has stated in Beijing that the policy of strengthening reforms in the country will continue.

The disrupted dialogue on many problems relating to the development of this country with its billion people must also be continued. [video shows Kulikov standing outside the Soviet Embassy in Beijing; street scenes; black and white TV footage of troops; people laying wreaths; the photographs and descriptions (in Chinese) of people being sought; fuzzy black and white film of a group of young people around a table (apparently taken with a concealed camera); people being frog-marched away by uniformed men]

Northeast Asia

ROK Politician Gives News Conference in Moscow

SK1606101889 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 7 Jun 89

[From the "Today's World" program]

[Text] As we have reported, today, at the World Economics and International Relations Institute under the USSR Academy of Sciences in Moscow, Kim Yong-sam, president of the Korea Reunification Democratic Party, who

has been in the Soviet Union at the invitation of Primakov, director of this institute, gave an interview to Soviet and foreign reporters. Professor Vladimir Watsilov, deputy director of the institute, opened this news conference. He said that conversations and meetings with President Kim Yong-sam in Moscow and Leningrad were fruitful. In the press release, Kim Yong-sam said:

[Begin Kim Yong-sam recording] I am on a visit to the Soviet Union, with which Korea has no diplomatic relations, for the first time as a politician with an invitation. Therefore, my visit this time is a historic event of great significance. Korea and the Soviet Union established friendly relations of [word indistinct] a hundred years. However, witnessing the tragedies of (?colonization) and (?military alliance), [words indistinct]. Later, due to the [words indistinct] of the East-West cold war ideology and confrontation, relations between the two countries, which are close neighbors on geopolitical terms, entered into the dark period of history in which the two countries entered the most remote and estranged relations. The lesson of history, that it is natural that such dark tragic hours and hours of [word indistinct], in which (?order) and harmony are coexist, shows that we, living today, will be able to turn the relations between Korea and the Soviet Union into relations of (?joy) and reconciliation if we make an effort. I feel at this very moment that it is time that we do so.

During my stay, I paid a call not only on researchers of this institute, but also on Dr Primakov, chairman of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce [name indistinct]; and the mayor of Moscow. I realized that there is no large obstacle to establishing and developing relations of goodneighborliness and friendship, if not normal diplomatic relations for now. [end recording]

Afterward, President Kim Yong-sam answered reporters' questions.

[Announcer, reading reporter's question] My name is [name indistinct]. Mr president, what are your relations with President No Tae-u? Did you meet and talk with him before you left for the Soviet Union?

[Begin Kim Yong-sam recording] I met President No Tae-u before I left Korea. I met with him for 4 hours. We talked very specifically about my visit to the Soviet Union. I will return to Korea via the United States on 20 June. We reached an agreement when I left Korea. We promised that we will meet to discuss all the matters a day or two after I return to Korea. When I return on 20 June, [passage indistinct]. I will meet with President No Tae-u a day or two after I return home. I will discuss with him all the matters concerning my visit to the Soviet Union. [end recording]

[Announcer, reading reporter's quesiton] I am [name indistinct], reporter of TASS. [Words indistinct] at the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee?

[Begin Kim Yong-sam recording] The International Department [words indistinct]. Therefore, I had lunch with Brutents, first deputy chief of the International Department, at the (?headquarters of the Central Committee). Because we talked even after we had had lunch, [words indistinct]. [end recording]

[Announcer, reading reporter's question] Was the issue of Korean people living in the Soviet Union, for example, Korean people living on Sakhalin, discussed during your current visit? Did you discuss the possibility of their visit to Korea?

[Begin Kim Yong-sam recording] [Passage indistinct] I think the repatriation of Korean residents living on Sakhalin is very important from a humanitarian standpoint. Therefore, this was an issue that I considered important in talks with [word indistinct]. Korean residents living on Sakhalin have a very unfortunate past. Generally, they are in their seventies. They will die soon. They cannot work, [words indistinct]. The number of Korean residents that fit this category is not many—approximately 200. Their home towns are Seoul, Pusan, Kwangju, Chonju, and other places. They want to be buried in their home towns. I told the Soviet side that from a humanitarian standpoint it must [word indistinct] their earnest desire to be buried in their home towns and to be buried next to their ancestors' graves. The Soviet side accepted this as a serious matter. They almost completely understood this matter. A decision was made that the Soviet side would inform me of the result of their consideration before I left for Korea. This is very good news. [end recording]

President Kim Yong-sam [words indistinct].

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Burmese Students Demand Reopening of Schools

BK1706101589 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1430 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] According to a dispatch from Rangoon, Burmese students have demanded the simultaneous reopening of all universities, colleges, and schools throughout Burma. The students made the demand following the announcement by the Burmese authorities for phased reopening of universities, colleges, and schools.

A 19-man committee representing various universities held a press conference and declared that the reopening of schools by the authorities was a trick aimed at undermining the unity of students engaged in the movement for demcracy. Ko Min Lin, a 16-year old member of the committee, said the students will continue with their fight until after the military authorities have transferred power to a government elected by the people.

The student delegates accused the military government of arresting over 100 students between the ages of 12 and 18 since 18 September 1988 for distributing anti-government propaganda. Meanwhile, Rangoon Radio has announced a decree banning distribution of materials which criticize Burma's Law and Order Restoration Council. Observers believe that General Saw Maung's government is worried there might be renewed student unrest once the universities, colleges, and schools are reopened and they note that the decree banning demonstrations and gatherings remains in force.

Burmese Talks With Karen Insurgents Advocated

BK1506065389 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1430 GMT 14 Jun 89

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, according to news reaching here, it is understood that intense battles are raging between the Burmese Government Army and armed KNU [Karen National Union] insurgents at the Thai-Burmese border. The Burmese Army—which succeeded in seizing five of the most important KNU military bases in recent months—is now attacking the Phalu base, 13 kilometers from the Thai border town of Mae Sot. Our station commentator Aleksandr Vladimirov makes the following observations:

The campaign by the Burmese Army, like its recent successes, has brought about outstanding results. A spokesman for the rebels said that it appears the Burmese Army is intent on removing the Karen insurgency problem once and for all. Some observers believe the reason the Burmese Army is able to intensify its attacks is because of a greater tolerance shown by the Thai military authorities toward certain incidents.

Personally, I believe there are two reasons for the intensified attacks on the KNU. First, to clear the trading routes to Thailand that the KNU has controlled until recently, and second, to prove that the defense forces are capable of establishing law and order—one of the goals they took upon themselves to achieve before the holding of elections in that country.

The fact is, the war in Burma has lasted for 40 years. Throughout these years, there have been times when the government troops scored major victories. On the whole, however, secessionist problems and armed uprisings, which started with racial issues, still exist, perhaps even worse than before.

It is true that today the insurgents have been weakened at their very bases, and they no longer have an influence in many of Burma's regions. But, if we study the history of civil war in Burma, it becomes evident that a military solution alone cannot resolve profound political problems. It would not be correct to simply say that if a certain rebelling indigenous national group does not want to give up its arms, it must be an extremist group with criminal intent. There must be other reasons more profound than this. Many observers believe that the racial question, if left unsolved, will become a major problem—hampering all efforts to free Burma from its hardships at the national level.

The question is whether such a problem can be resolved peacefully through other means. Yes, it can. At least that is what former Prime Minister U Nu believed. Recently, he urged the military authorities to hold talks with the Karen rebels and offered to mediate in such peace talks. U Nu stressed that it would not be difficult to reach an agreement if both sides were ready to show good will.

Of course, it would not be as easy as the former prime minister would like to have it. Even more so in light of the view held by military spokesmen who have said the days of the Karen insurgents are numbered. But, the time for talks is right now because the defense forces, which could achieve military victory, could then show that they have the will to resolve social problems, however intricate they may be, through political means and dialogue with opposition forces. It is an outright necessity to have such a dialogue.

Near East & South Asia

Cultural, Scientific Agreement Signed With Iraq

LD1606185189 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—A plan of cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Iraq for 1989-1991 was signed in Moscow today. The plan envisages further expansion of relations between the two countries in education, exchange of information, public health, scientific research, radio and television, sports.

Speaking at the document-signing ceremony, Aleksandr Churlin, deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Department for Cultural Relations, stressed that "The Soviet Union attaches great significance to development of cooperation with Iraq in culture, science and education. There are considerable possibilities for interaction in these areas."

General director of the Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research Kutaybah Ahmad Shihab said that the plan of cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Iraq was based on the treaty of friendship and cooperation signed between the two countries in 1972. He expressed confidence that the Soviet-Iraqi relations in culture and science would continue gaining in strength.

Bessmertnykh Meets With PLO's 'Abbas 13 Jun

PM1906075789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] On 13 June A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR first deputy foreign minister, had a meeting with M. 'Abbas, member of the PLO executive committee, who is head of

the Palestinian side on the Soviet-Palestinian Near East Committee, a scheduled sitting of which has been held in Moscow.

During the conversation, which proceeded in a warm, friendly atmosphere, it was noted that the results of the recent pan-Arab summit conference in Casablanca represent an important step on the way to consolidating Arab ranks. Arab states have spoken out at the most authoritative level in favor of comprehensively settling the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of UN Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, fulfilling the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, and providing security guarantees for all states in the region. They again stressed the need to convene an international peace conference with the participation of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and all sides involved in the conflict.

The sides expressed deep concern at the continuous acts of violence by the Israeli authorities against the Palestinian civilian population and said that these inhuman actions must be immediately stopped.

M. 'Abbas informed the Soviet side on progress in implementing the PLO's policy of striving for a political settlement of the Near East conflict with regard for the interests of all the sides involved, stressing the Palestinians' firm intention to continue to seek mutually acceptable solutions in order to impart dynamism to the peace process.

A.A. Bessmertnykh highly appraised the realistic, constructive course taken by the PLO leadership and confirmed support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people.

When discussing the practical aspects of the settlement, both sides stressed the need to employ multi-option approaches to preparing and convening an international conference. In this respect, they pointed out that phased steps and interim measures could prove useful on the way to a comprehensive settlement, on the understanding that these would be implemented in coordination with a conference and a final settlement.

Expressing serious concern in connection with the situation in Lebanon, the sides stressed the need to stabilize the situation in this country as soon as possible and supported the peacemaking efforts of the Arab League to achieve reconciliation within Lebanon and ensure the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Lebanese state.

On behalf of the PLO leadership, M. 'Abbas expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet Union for its consistent support of the Palestinian people's struggle to end the occupation and fulfill their national aspirations. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the work of the Soviet-Palestinian committee and confirmed their mutual desire to increase coordination and collaboration on a broad range of international and regional problems.

Afghan Opposition's 'Government' Criticized

LD1606204489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 16 Jun 89

[From the "International Situation—Questions and Answers" program, presented by Igor Surguchev, all-union radio commentator on foreign politics]

[Text] I have in front of me several letters, the authors of which touch, in one way or another, on events in Afghanistan. The opinions expressed are, at times, diverse and sometimes even mutually exclusive. Perhaps the only point on which the majority, although not all, are agreed is the need to continue providing Afghanistan with humanitarian aid and diplomatic support. I shall mention among them our listener Kovaleva, from the settlement of Krasnaya Gora, Bryansk Oblast; and Comrade Zhelyayev, who lives in the town of Kaliningrad near Moscow. But that is not what we are going to deal with today. In his letter Comrade Matveyev, from the city of Leninabad, Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], asks a number of questions of a debatable nature. I have asked my colleague, Aleksandr Malikov, to answer them.

[Malikov] After reading Comrade Matveyev's letter right through, I must admit that I found myself feeling that I had already read or heard somewhere the thoughts which he expressed. Since my impressions of the Congress of People's Deputies have not grown cold, I remembered at once that I had occasion to hear something similar from the lips of Academician Sakharov. I shall not here go into the reaction which it prompted at that time in the hall and among many people. What is important, I feel, is that if these thoughts are circulating in people's minds, they cannot simply be brushed aside.

Now, to the point. Comrade Matveyev, saying that the Afghan opposition has created a new government with its own army, comes to the conclusion that Pakistan is assisting that government on almost a legal footing; and the thesis that the opposition is, in general, conducting themselves fairly worthily and patriotically emerges very clearly between the lines of his letter. I feel that Comrade Matveyev has gained, to put it mildy, a not altogether accurate impression—first, of the Afghan opposition and, second, of their aims. It must be noted that the part of the Afghan opposition which called itself the interim government of Afghanistan after lengthy arguments is no such thing, neither from the legal point of view nor simply by the standards of human common sense. I shall refer just to the opinion of Mujadeddi, its formal head, who has admitted to journalists that the so-called interim government represents, at most, one-third of the opposition. It turns out that some kind of artificial structure has been created: a government without a

people and without territory, with only ministerial portfolios. And, if it were different, I make bold to assure you that Washington and Islamabad would not force them to wait for recognition.

And now, for the so-called army which is subordinate to that so-called government. The opposition does not have such an organizational structure as an army. There exist merely heterogeneous armed groupings, which have their own field commanders. These commanders, on the territory of Afghanistan, are often at odds with each other, laying claim to unlimited power, to say nothing of the fact that for most of them, the opinion of those members of the so-called cabinet of ministers who are living very quiet lives in luxurious residences somewhere near Islamabad or Peshawar is not an order at all. Incidentally, more and more commanders in the field are moving toward the idea of a dialogue with the Najibullah government, seeing in its actions not an ostentatious, but a real understanding of the Afghans' needs, and a manifestation of patriotism, since the criteria for this are now crystal-clear: A patriot is someone who, after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops, does not want any more bloodshed and proposes that rifles should be removed from shoulders and that there should be a move away from the trenches to the negotiating table. A patriot is soneone who wants to remove all the mines from the body of the Afghan land, bury the hatchet of internecine strife, restore the flouted traditions, forget the nightmare of the feudal past and place Afghanistan on the road of civilization.

Objectively speaking, it is the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and its program, even though it was not free of serious mistakes in the past, rather than Najibullah's opponents, that match far more closely with all these criteria. The opposition, on the other hand, especially its fundamentalist wing, almost entirely merits the label mercenary produced by the UNITED NATIONS, since it is entirely supported by other people's money and fights with other people's weapons, killing its own fellow-citizens. One can only call these people patriots by standing everything on its head, just like describing Pakistan's aid to the mercenaries as legitimate, in fact.

Improvement of Pakistani-Soviet Ties Urged
BK1606115989 Moscow in Urdu to Pakistan 1300 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Station commentator Vladimir Viktorov commentary]

[Text] While overflying the Soviet territory on her way home from her U.S. tour, Ms Benazir Bhutto sent a telegram to the Soviet president, expressing her desire to further improve relations between the two countries. Our commentator Vladimir Viktorov writes: Although sending good-will messages from aboard the plane is a normal diplomatic practice, we don't want to consider Ms Bhutto's message of good wishes as a mere diplomatic tradition. In view of the cool Soviet-Pakistani relations over the past few years due to known reasons, we would consider such telegrams as a heartening gesture in the direction of the normalization of bilateral relations; and we expect so, especially because during the last few weeks, the Pakistani prime minister has repeatedly raised voice in favor of establishing friendly relations with the Soviet Union. Such intentions can be welcomed provided they are sincere.

Pakistan's long-term cooperation with the Soviet Union in various fields has proved very useful, both economically and politically. During the past 30 years, Pakistan has considerably strengthened its economic autarky thanks to the Soviet aid for its economic development. The USSR's constructive attitude toward international problems proves immensely helpful in the solution of socioeconomic problems of a developing country like Pakistan. It is perhaps unnecessary here to name all spheres of Soviet-Pakistani relations, but the important thing is that the Soviet aid is offered in sectors in which Pakistan has been facing serious difficulties. For the past 20 years, Pakistan had been urging its Western allies to help set up a steel mill, but it always got a negative response. It was only the Soviet Union which extended a helping hand in the construction of a major steel manufacturing plant in Karachi, which is now regarded as the pearl of the Pakistani economy. As is known, local steel production provides the infrastructure for the development of other modern sectors of the economy.

The Soviet Union also provided massive assistance to Pakistan in the development of its energy sector. Besides helping in the construction of the Guddu power plant, the Soviet experts have also started building a thermal power plant at Multan which will enable Pakistan to solve its serious energy shortage. In the electricity generation sector, there has been a good tradition of Soviet-Pakistani cooperation. It should be noted that last year Pakistan asked for Soviet assistance in the establishment of a few major industrial and power generation projects.

All these things reflect the bright prospects for the development of bilateral relations. But, regrettably, full benefits are not being reaped from them. This is so because Islamabad does not respond positively to the USSR's good-neighborly policy toward Pakistan. Apart from this, the Afghanistan problem also casts a negative impact on this. As a guarantor to the well-known Geneva accords on Afghanistan, the Soviet Union cannot but express its serious concern over Islamabad's violations of the accords. Moscow is undoubtedly aware that Pakistan's policy on Afghanistan does not solely depend on the country's leadership; and regrettably, certain external powers, which utilize Pakistan in achieving their strategic interests in this region, also cast adverse effects on Soviet-Pakistani relations. In this context, we would like to recall a political maxim here which says that the foreign policy of any country must be in keeping with its own national interests and it must not become a trump in the hands of others who want to achieve their objectives by harming interests of others.

In view of these facts, we will again turn to the Afghanistan problem. The past 4 months since the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan have proved the failure of all attempts to overthrow the Kabul government. At the same time, it is also becoming increasingly clear that the Pakistani support for the Afghan war at the behest of the United States may also adversely affect the situation inside Pakistan, because one cannot ensure one's security while endangering the security of a neighboring country. The time has now come to realistically assess the situation, and it seems that the Islamabad authorities have now begun to do that. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, for example, has spoken time and again, and even during her talks with President George Bush, in favor of a political settlement of the Afghan tangle. Such statements will naturally be welcomed. But one thing that compels us to remain cautious is Pakistan's reaffirmation of support for the armed struggle of Afghan rebels on the one hand and its declaration of support for a political settlement of the Afghan problem on the other. The other more disturbing thing is the attempt now being made to baselessly blame the Soviet Union for the continuing war in Afghanistan.

Our commentator adds: I don't want to be swayed by emotions, but I cannot help saying that Pakistan and the Soviet Union may have divergent attitudes toward one or more issues, but they should have common outlooks in guaranteeing the peaceful life and welfare of their own people and those of the neighboring countries. The Soviet Union has repeatedly announced, even at the highest level, its willingness to improve its ties with Pakistan, and the settlement of the Afghanistan problem can prove to be a motivating force in the development of bilateral relations. Hence, instead of indulging in wishful thinking, we should work with realism.

Messages Exchanged on Jordanian Holiday

PM1606104189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Greetings"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent King Husayn Ibn-Talal, king of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, a telegram conveying congratulations to the friendly Jordanian people on their national holiday—Independence Day. Confidence was expressed that the further development and strengthening of Soviet-Jordanian cooperation will contribute to mankind's progress toward a nuclear-free and safe world, to the improvement of international relations, and the settlement of conflict situations, and to the establishment of a just peace in the Near East.

In a reply telegram the king, on behalf of the people and government of Jordan and on his own account, expressed sincere gratitude for the warm congratulations and appreciation of the USSR's position in support of the Arabs' just cause and the struggle for the establishment of a lasting peace in the Near East and in the world as a whole.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Reportage on Ethiopia's Eritrean Proposals

Peace Overtures to Separatists Welcomed

PM1606095389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by G. Ustinov: "Eritrea: Seeking a Peaceful Solution"]

[Text] Addis Ababa—They had been waiting a long time for this event in Eritrea. So it was greeted with great public interest and excitement. I am referring to the important initiatives aimed at a peaceful solution of the Eritrean problem. They were unanimously adopted at an extraordinary session of the Shengo—the country's National Assembly.

The Ethiopian revolution is 15 years old this year. Throughout this period there have been hostilities in the north of the republic. The conflict was inherited from the monarchical regime. It has cost many thousands of lives, has caused and is still causing enormous damage to the national economy, forces Ethiopia to keep an impossibly large army under arms, and is inexorably pushing Ethiopia into the category of underdeveloped states.

The "Eritrean People's Liberation Front" and the "'Tigray' People's Liberation Front" separatist organizations are waging an armed struggle against the republic and its current leadership, wanting these two northern provinces to break away from Ethiopia. It cannot be said that President Mengistu's government has not tried in the past to settle this unwarrantedly and hopelessly protracted conflict by political means. Such steps have been taken repeatedly. But the chief method has been to quell the opposition militarily. The leaders of the separatists have also behaved with overt intransigence.

The history of the conflict has demonstrated that it cannot be resolved by force of arms. That is why the National Assembly, on behalf of the Ethiopian people, has invited opposition parties, organizations, and currents to the negotiating table.

It was proposed that the negotiations start without any preliminary conditions and be conducted by democratic means, that is, in an atmosphere of openness and glasnost, in the presence of observers chosen by mutual agreement. It is intended that the same agreements should determine the date and venue of the negotiations. The Shengo has expressed its willingness to take the necessary preparatory steps and has solemnly announced that these peace proposals are addressed to all who sincerely seek peace on Ethiopian soil.

At a press conference for foreign and local journalists President Mengistu Haile Mariam said that the new peace initiatives express the aspirations of the 48 million Ethiopian people. A political settlement of the Eritrean problem could bring long-awaited peace to the population of the country's northern regions, where combat operations have been going on for 28 years now. It is now up to the opposition organizations, which must see that the bloody fratricidal war is utterly senseless.

Offer To Discuss Peace Initiatives Noted

PM1506111589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 89 First Edition p 1

[Sergey Demidov dispatch under the "Correspondents Comment" rubric: "Unraveling the Eritrean Knot"]

[Text] Addis Ababa, 12 Jun—The question of the problem of Eritrea, where the embers of the war waged by the separatist movement against the Ethiopian Government have first smoldered, then raged for 28 years now, is still open today.

The first emergency session of the Ethiopian Shengo (National Assembly), held at the request of the republic's president, was devoted to the elaboration of a new state peace strategy, which people here hope should continue the path leading out of the Eritrean deadlock.

Ethiopian leader Mengistu Haile Mariam delivered a speech at the session to Ethiopian parliamentary deputies.

Thousands of people have died as a result of actions carried out by Eritrean People's Liberation Front formations. These actions have also had fatal consequences for Ethiopia's economy.

The president recalled that the Workers Party of Ethiopia [WPE] and the country's government have frequently submitted numerous proposals and appeals to the separatist leaders to heed the voice of the wretched people and come to the negotiating table in order to find a common thread by joint efforts and unravel the tight Eritrean knot. However, these attempts have borne no fruit as of yet. That is why the number one task facing the people's elected representatives is to examine and approve a concrete program for further peace initiatives.

The draft documents containing these initiatives, which were elaborated beforehand at sittings of the parliamentary commissions, were read out by Shewandagn Belete, secretary of the WPE Central Committee. Their essence is as follows: The Ethiopian leadership is prepared without any preliminary conditions whatsoever to meet and enter into contact with all opposition forces and groupings that express good will and show interest in cooperating with the republic's authorities; to conduct talks openly and publicly and in the presence of an observer appointed with agreement from both sides; and to take any additional steps to facilitate the successful progress of these talks and ultimately establish a long and lasting peace in Eritrea.

The session unanimously adopted the document entitled "The New Ethiopian Peace Initiative to Resolve the Eritrean Problem."

Burundi Foreign Minister Arrives in Moscow 13 Jun

PM1406142789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Arrival in Moscow"]

[Text] C. Mbonimpa, Burundian minister of foreign affairs and cooperation, arrived on a working visit to Moscow 13 June.

He was met at the airport by A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

I. Nkeramihigo, Burundian ambassador to the Soviet Union, was among the welcoming party.

Holds Talks With Adamishin

LD1506133989 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—The talks between Anatoliy Adamishin, Soviet deputy foreign minister, and Cyprien Mbonimpa, Burundian minister of foreign affairs and cooperation, which were held here on Wednesday, confirmed that the sides hold identical or close positions on several international issues.

The diplomats underscored the importance of honouring in present-day international relations the principles of equality and respect of the freedom of choice for all states, big and small, the need to assert new thinking and political methods of handling existing problems.

The interlocutors thoroughly discussed the state and prospects for Soviet-Burundian cooperation in a variety of areas, specifically in the economy and in training national personnel.

In analysing the situation in various areas of Africa, including in hot spots of the continent, the sides pointed out that the existing regional conflicts should be settled on the basis of non-confrontational approach, through the quest for common rather than dividing elements.

Mbonimpa is staying in the USSR on a working visit, the first in the more than a quarter of a century since the establishment of Soviet-Burundian relations.

Primakov Receives Minister

LD1506025689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2128 GMT 14 Jun 89

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] On 14 June Comrade Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received Mbonimpa, the minister of foreign affairs and cooperation of the Republic of Burundi, who is in our country on a working visit. The visitor from Burundi handed over a message from Buyoya, president of the Republic of Burundi, for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

Comrade Primakov informed the visitor about the results of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. It was emphasized that the principles of the foreign policy of the Soviet state, which are enshrined in the message to the peoples of the world that was adopted by the congress, reflect the striving of the Soviet people for a democratization of the world order with a firm observance of the right of people to freedom of choice, independence and sovereignty.

During the conversation both sides confirmed their striving to strengthen friendly Soviet-Burundi relations. [Video shows Primakov receiving the Burundi foreign minister]

Zimbabwean Party Delegation Ends USSR Visit

PM1506105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Stay"]

[Text] A delegation from the Zimbabwean African National Union—Patriotic Front [ZANU-PF] headed by N. Mawema, deputy secretary of the ZANU-PF Central Committee, which was familiarized with CPSU activity in conditions of restructuring, was in our country 6 through 11 June in accordance with a protocol on CPSU-ZANU-PF cooperation.

Benin Party Delegation Ends USSR Visit

PM1506104789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation from the Benin People's Revolutionary Party [PRPB] headed by K.F. Azodogbehou, member of the PRPB Central Committee, was in the Soviet Union 30 May through 12 June in accordance with the plan for interparty ties. The delegation was familiarized with the experience of the CPSU's ideological work under conditions of restructuring.

Commentary on Spread of South African Violence

MB1706174089 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Station commentary]

[Text] South African Police reports say six black citizens, and one policeman, have been killed and a police van bombed. Four people have been shot and one policeman beaten to death in the black suburbs in Durban and Pietermaritzburg in Natal Province.

The spread of violence in South Africa exceeds all imaginable limits. This applies also to Natal Province. All the above listed events took place here in the [words indistinct] the police put them all under a category of political crimes, and the result of longstanding strife between the supporters of the socialist United Democratic Front [UDF] and the more conservative [word indistinct] organization Inkatha [words indistinct] clashes and about 2,000 people have died in Natal Province in the last few years, it should compel the government to take more drastic steps to stopping them. Those measures are being taken. The authorities extended nation wide the state of emergency which allows the police to detain people without bringing any charges against them, and to carry out searches without a search warrant.

In the last 3 years, over 30,000 people have been detained in the conditions of the state of emergency [words indistinct] almost 3 years and the extension of the state of emergency over the country was accompanied by new restrictions.

In keeping with them, for example, the leader of the UDF in Natal, Archie Gumede, was banned from all political activities. He was removed from the political scene right on the eve of talks between the UDF and Inkatha [word indistinct] an attempt was expected to bring the animosity between the two to a stop.

Spokesman for the government declared that the ban on Gumede's activities bore no relation to the proposed talks. In [words indistinct] however [words indistinct] Archbishop Desmond Tutu claimed the opposite. Without a Gumede, the chances for an early agreement between the UDF and Inkatha became slimmer. As a result the talks never took place.

Throughout the last few years, indirect evidence has appeared on many occasions suggesting that the government has been deliberately fanning the animosity in Natal by giving support to Inkatha [words indistinct] dialogue between the races. President Botha was for such a dialogue [words indistinct] but now that Frederick de Klerk speaks about the new deal of dialogue, Botha is [words indistinct] again Inkatha is opposed deliberately to the UDF. After all, new restrictions did not [word indistinct] unto it [words indistinct] the fact that [words

indistinct] the government is any rapprochement or even discontinuation of the strife between Inkatha and the UDF [words indistinct] to the ANC.

As far as the dialogue between races is concerned, it is one thing for the government to carry it out with the moderate Buthelezi, the leader of Inkatha, and quite another thing to conduct talks with a Buthelezi who has come to an agreement with the UDF and the ANC [words indistinct] such as turn of events quite feasable. Buthelezi is [word indistinct] one of the degree of the influence of the ANC has.

There surely are differences between the two. But they could [word indistinct] common language on one thing. Both are opponents of the system of apartheid. Small wonder the [words indistinct] rapprochement between the two as dangerous and as something that should be prevented by all means, and the methods used for this are the same. The [words indistinct] contradictions and the psychosis of animosity the more tangible [words indistinct] the more reason the government will have for extending the state of emergency, staging provocations and for issuing incomprehensive reports about, what is termed as, political disturbances.

The situation is changing, however, and the hope that it cannot [words indistinct].

East Europe

Text of 9 Jun USSR-GDR Joint Statement Published

PM1106180189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[USSR-GDR joint statement: "Joint Statement on Official Friendly Visit to GDR by USSR Foreign Minister"; the issuing of the joint statement was reported on page 17 of the 12 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

[Text] Berlin—At the invitation of the party and state leadership of the GDR, E.A. Shevardnadze, Soviet foreign minister and CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, paid an official friendship visit to the GDR on 9 June, 1989.

Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, received Eduard Shevardnadze for a friendly talk, the focus of which was the further development and deepening of the fraternal relations between the GDR and the USSR and close collaboration in the international arena.

Both sides expressed their satisfaction at the high level and the active shaping of relations between the SED and the CPSU and the USSR and the GDR at their fraternal, equal, and confidential nature.

The determination was reaffirmed to cooperate very closely in the future, too, united in firm friendship and internationalist solidarity and supported by the shared views on the principled questions of socialist construction and foreign policy.

Oskar Fischer and Eduard A. Shevardnadze, the foreign ministers of the GDR and the USSR, exchanged views on matters of the further development of bilateral relations and international policy.

They noted with satisfaction that the cooperation between the GDR and the USSR in the implementation of the agreements reached by Erich Honecker and Mikhail Gorbachev in September 1988 is developing with great dynamism and intensity. In all important areas of social life, measures are being implemented on the deepening and expanding of cooperation. These commitments are strategic in scope and reach into the new millenium. They are aimed primarily at raising the efficiency of social production, consolidating collaboration in the main directions of scientific-technical progress, deepening specialization and cooperation, and broadly expanding direct relations and other modern forms of cooperation.

The two sides agreed to cooperate in fostering language and culture, literature and art among Soviet citizens of German nationality. Establishing partnership relations between Schwerin Bezirk and Pavlodar Oblast also serves this purpose.

During the exchange of views on international questions, both states announced the firm intention to shape collaboration in the implementation of the joint peace initiatives of the Warsaw Pact states more effectively and to make an active contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the coordinated foreign policy course.

The USSR and GDR advocate to improve the cooperation with all socialist fraternal states and to enrich it with contents commensurate with the present development stage of world socialism.

Oskar Fischer paid tribute to the normalization of the relations between the USSR and the PRC as an event of historic import for the further development of world politics.

The interlocutors expressed their satisfaction about the results of the meeting of the Foreign Ministers Committee of the Warsaw Pact states in Berlin on 11 and 12 April 1989 and emphasized the significance and topicality of the documents accepted. The GDR and USSR are going to support the implementation of the documents with all their strength.

Oskar Fischer and Eduard A. Shevardnadze praised the general improvement in the international climate, the revival of intergovernmental dialogue and the increase

in the world community members' preparedness to search for mutually acceptable solutions. To this end the constructive initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had contributed to a not inconsiderable degree. They called for purposeful efforts by all states to overcome the outdated confrontational approach and to implement the new political thinking which replaces the old enemy images with partnership cooperation in safeguarding peace in intergovernmental relations.

The GDR and USSR attach great significance to the appeal of the Warsaw Pact states to the NATO member states and advocate that direct contacts between the two military-political alliances be started and a constructive security-political dialogue be conducted.

The ministers underlined the need to increase efforts to promote the disarmament process further. They welcomed the impending resumpton of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on strategic and space weapons as the cardinal problem of the disarmament process, as well as the positive start of the Vienna negotiations on conventional forces and on confidence and security-building measures in Europe. The GDR and USSR's willingness to conduct these negotiations constructively and to work for early results was emphasizd. In this connection, the two sides referred to the proposals on the radical reduction of arms and troops of the two alliances, as submitted by the Warsaw Pact states. The unilateral disarmament steps decided on by the two countries—as well as other Warsaw Pact states—in the conventional area and already embarked upon, in addition to the announced unilateral withdrawal of 500 tactical nuclear warheads by the USSR from the territory of the allied states, are convincing affirmation of their intention not to permit a pause in the disarmament process.

The foreign ministers characterized the proposal submitted by the U.S. President at the Brussels NATO summit on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe as a step in the right direction. This proposal is at present being thoroughly examined. The GDR and the USSR welcome any initiative which speeds up the Vienna talks and which can contribute to results on the basis of equal and undiminished security of all participants. The two sides called emphatically for the immediate start of negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons, spoke out against all measures for their modernization, and called for the complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons. They are firmly convinced that the historic opportunity now opening up to achieve a great breakthrough in all areas of military confrontation on the European Continent must be utilized. The conviction was expressed that it is necessary to conclude, as quickly as possible, an international convention on the ban and elimination of chemical weapons.

The USSR expressed support for the constructive policy of dialogue and cooperation pursued by the GDR and the initiatives it submitted, including the creation of a nuclear-free zone, a chemical weapons-free zone, and a zone of security and confidence in Central Europe.

The ministers paid special attention to the all European process for the consolidation and development of the positive trends on this continent. They called for multiplying the efforts of the states in erecting a secure "common European home" based on good-neighborliness.

Regarding the upcoming 50th anniversary of the beginning of World War II, it was underlined that the most important lessons of the tragic past consisted in excluding war from the life of mankind. The absolute priority of this task required of all states a responsible policy and concrete deeds for creating a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. The ministers said that strict respect for the existing territorial and political realities, the principle of the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, is the fundamental precondition for a stable peace in Europe and beyond. To this corresponds the historic duty of the two German states to do everything to ensure that war will never again emanate from German soil.

The foreign ministers resolutely rejected attacks on the sovereign right of the GDR to safeguard the security and inviolability of her borders. The GDR and USSR continue to see it as their duty to uncompromisingly oppose any actions which could jeopardize peace and stability in Europe and which are incompatible with the spirit and the letter of the Helsinki Final Act. At the same time, concern about increasing appearances of neo-Nazism, which call for determined unmasking and rejection, was expressed.

There was an exchange of views on the state and outlook of the relations the two states have with the FRG. Proceeding from the existing treaties, the two sides once again affirmed their interest in the development of a good-neighbor relationship with the FRG, which serves peaceful cooperation and stable security in Europe.

They affirmed the willingness to develop further relations with West Berlin on the basis of strict adherence to the full application of the quadripartite agreement of 3 September, 1971, which is an essential element in safeguarding peace and detente in Europe.

Oskar Fischer and Eduard A. Shevardnadze declared the determination of the GDR and USSR to contribute to solving all international problems and conflicts by political means. In this connection, they appealed to all sides concerned to strictly adhere to the Geneva accords on Afghanistan and to work toward the quickest possible start of an intra-Afghan dialogue and the creation of a coalition government, on the broadest-possible basis, in order to end the bloodshed and reestablish peace, security, and stability in that region.

The foreign ministers signed an agreement on the establishment and work of a GDR cultural and information center in the USSR which is meant to contribute to the expansion of cooperation in the political and intellectual-cultural area.

The talks and negotiations take place in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and total mutual accord. Eduard A. Shevardnadze conveyed to Oskar Fischer an invitation to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

GDR's Fischer Cited on Talks With Shevardnadze

OW1506134389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Jun 89

[Interview with Oscar Fischer, GDR minister of foreign affairs, by special correspondent Zholkver; date and place of interview not given; recorded; from the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] We have reported that Comrade Shevardnadze made a short visit to Berlin. Our special correspondent interviewed Oscar Fischer, GDR minister of foreign affairs.

[Begin recording] [Zholkver] Berlin is becoming an important center of European politics. What aspects of these policies have been particularly reflected in your discussions with Comrade Shevardnadze?

[Fischer, speaking in German, fading into Russian translation provided by Zholkver] Our discussions were very intensive and fruitful, and they were held in a very good working atmosphere and in the spirit of friendship and unity. We exchanged views on bilateral relations, as well as on important international problems. We outlined a broad program for further development of our cooperation in politics, economy, and culture. In particular, we signed an agreement on the opening of a GDR information and cultural center in Moscow. For us, this has a special, principled significance because, this year, we shall be marking the 40th anniversary of our state.

In international affairs, special attention was paid to questions of disarmament. We made relevant proposals as far back as the Berlin session of the Warsaw Treaty Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, which you mentioned. Currently, we note with satisfaction that both the U.S. President and leaders of other NATO countries are, finally, responding to our initiatives. What is needed now is for the NATO countries to follow the example of socialist states and begin specific action in the sphere of disarmament. [end recording]

Reburial Ceremony for Hungary's Nagy Reported

LD2006013389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1855 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Video report by correspondent Yevgeniy Shirkov in Budapest; recorded—from the "World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] [Video shows Shirokov and street scenes] The Square of Heroes, the most beautiful and most spacious square in Budapest, has acquired its usual look—a cordial, festive look. Once again there are crowds of tourists here admiring the unique architectural mix, hurrying to the nearby museum. Yet somehow it is hard to believe that just 2 days ago the square was bedecked in the trappings of mourning.

More than 250,000 people came here last Friday [16 June] to take part in the solemn reburial of the remains of Imre Nagy, the former prime minister of Hungary, and his four closest comrades in arms who had been sentenced to death for particpation in the events of 1956. Progressing along the path of democratization, the government of the republic took the humane step of permitting their remains—which had been buried in an unmarked grave—to be buried in a humane manner. This had been requested by the family of Imre Nagy and the others who were put to death.

It is hardly likely that the historical process and phenomena will give way to a singular definition, especially when it concerns such a complicated concentration of phenomena as were the Hungarian events in the fall of 1956. It is obvious that the passions of the present political struggle in Hungarian society are making a strong impression on the objectivity of the evaluation of those events.

Standing here in the square filled to overflowing with people, many of whom were holding little flags bearing pictures of Imre Nagy and the old Hungarian coat of arms, I thought how it was only at the start of this year that some interpretations of the events of 1956 as a people's uprising were published. Such an approach has now become widespread—even the prevailing approach. It is typical that the national banners are hung in the square just as in 1956—with the place where the coat of arms of the Hungarian People's Republic had been cut out. One cannot deny it. The so called Committee for the Restoration of Historical Justice, jointly with a whole series of opposition and alternative organizations, attempted to ensure that the whole of this deeply impressive ritual went ahead to no small extent on the idea of rehabilitating those who in those tragic days went against the forces of a popular democratic system.

Yes, it is a natural decision to carry out a humane action under the sign of national reocnciliation, for the sake of the restoration of justice. And the plenum of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] Central Committee which took place at the end of May upheld such an approach. It stressed that it would be a be a new shock if the funeral of Imre Nagy turned into an event dividing the nation.

One has to give the organizers their due. There were no excesses. There were no incidents. In the solemn atmosphere of grieving, in the presence of the government and the heads of parliament and numerous delegations from abroad, tribute was paid to the memory of people who have, for their acts and errors, borne a groundlessly serious punishment which was dictated more by political considerations. But in the speeches of those who spoke in

the square and later at the cemetery where the burial took place scathing anti-Soviet attacks were heard. They were in obvious discord with the strictly mournful ceremony. There were words to the effect that blatant external interference crushed the revolution of 1956 and put an end to the strivings and hopes of Hungarians. The former chairman of the so-called Workers' Council of Budapest stated: The presence of Soviet troops on the territory of Hugnary casts a cloud over our lives even today. And a representative of the opposition union of young democrats, who took it upon himself to speak on behalf of all Hungarian young people, asserted that Russian occupation of the country and a communist dictatorship have been continuing for 40 years now.

We saw supporters of approximately the same views the previous evening outside the Soviet Embassy during a demonstration by approximately 200 representatives of alternative youth organizations. They shouted slogans and words offensive to our country; they also spoke of Russian occupation. But surely 200 people with flashlights are not the whole of Hungarian young people. And surely one cannot reappraise the events of fall 1956 without remembering the victims of violence and terror obviously perpetrated by the enemies of people's power and the cutthroats and criminals affiliated with them. The majority understand that and do not allow themselves to give way to hysteria and the heating up of passions.

Budapest is quiet. Today I visited the cemetery where Imre Nagy and his comrades—as well as unknown people, at times misled, who were the victims of fratricidal clashes, martyrs—are buried. We saw that people really do want national reconciliation to triumph, the struggle for the renewal of society to progress along the course of democracy, trust, and national unity. [video shows scenes at the Nagy funeral ceremony in the Square of Heroes, demonstration at Soviet Embassy, scenes at the cemetery]

Reform Proposals Submitted to Hungarian Assembly
LD1506095289 Moscow TASS in English 0938 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Text] Budapest June 15 TASS—The Hungarian Government has suggested that the National Assembly abolish capital punishment for political crimes.

In its formal proposal it said, for example, that Imre Nagy, one of the leaders during the 1956 events in Hungary who was sentenced to death for his part in them, was an outstanding statesman whose democratic national aspirations are now part of Hungarian policy.

The government dissociated itself from what it called erroneous and often criminal political decisions made in the past and from the reprisals which followed the 1956 events.

It also expressed firm determination to close an epoch that brought a great many ordeals, and urged the nation to show unity.

The government said that it is essential to focus the efforts and creative energies of Hungarian society on building a new, democratic Hungary.

The remains of Nagy and his followers executed together with him, who were buried in nameless graves, will be reentered in Budapest on Friday [16 June].

Hungarian Assembly Approves Halting of Dam Project
PM1506090789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 11

[B. Rodionov article: "Danube—'Pause for Thought'"]

[Text] The Hungarian State Assembly has approved the government decision to halt work on the Nagymaros Hydroelectric Project—a component of the Hungarian-Czechoslovak hydroelectric system on the Danube. There were 35 abstentions. A new scientific survey will be conducted. The State Assembly empowered the Council of Ministers to begin talks with the Czechoslovak side on the terms and possible consequences of changing the interstate agreement on building a joint hydroelectric power system.

Addressing parliament, Prime Minister M. Nemeth denied that the decision had been adopted under political pressure (this refers to pressure from the opposition, whose banners declared that it would battle the "Nagymaros dragon" until victory). M. Nemeth opposes a referendum on Nagymaros, on which the opposition—which has collected over 160,000 signatures in favor of its demand—insists. It has been agreed that in making their final decision on the fate of the construction project, the government and parliament should rely on accurate scientific figures obtained, if possible, by impartial specialists from abroad. The premier self-critically admitted that during the discussion of the question in parliament last October he campaigned for continuing the construction. He complained about an excessive burden of responsibility as a result of the fact that in Hungary "some academics see red where others see green." He described the government decision as a "pause for thought." M. Nemeth recalled that in the fall the parliament agreed to continue construction only if ecological interests were given priority over economic interests and if the ecological risk were minimized.

The premier explained that the halting of the work relates exclusively to the Nagymaros Hydroelectric Plant; construction of hydroelectric installations higher up the Danube in the region of the Hungarian-Czechoslovak border—construction that is already nearing completion—will be continued. But even there we need to beef up ecological demands still further in conjunction with the Czechoslovak side.

The deputies who spoke in the debate expressed various opinions. Some called the fall vote for the continuation of construction "shameful" and demanded the resignation of the minister who gave the report, while others expressed concern for the future of good relations with neighboring countries. In this respect the preliminary talks which M. Nemeth recently held in Prague and Vienna were assessed positively. Parliamentary veteran Academician Bognar drew attention to the fact that the Danube project has become a political problem dividing the nation.

The results of the discussion have shown that the upper hand is being gained not by artificially inflamed emotions, but by ideas of state expediency. An additional urgent study of the ecological, economic, and other aspects of the problem lies ahead, and then the final decision will be made on the fate of the Hungarian part of the project—a decision which will obviously be made by parliament.

Correspondent Views Polish Election Results

PM1006144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent Oleg Losoto report under "Observer's Notes" rubric: "Both Reforms and Consensus"]

[Text] In Poland the official results of the first round of the elections to the Sejm and the Polish Senate have just been published. They bear witness to the considerable success of the opposition candidates, who have already gained 92 out of 100 seats in the Senate (the remaining 8 places will be fought over in the second round of the elections) and have also in practical terms gained 35 percent of the seats in the Sejm. The government coalition has secured the other 65 percent. Here there were no victors in many electoral districts in the first round of the elections. The second round will take place 18 June, when the coalition candidates will compete for the deputies' seats which are designated specifically for members of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], the United Peasant Party, and the Democratic Party.

The majority of the candidates on the all-Polish electoral roll also failed to surmount the necessary vote hurdle. These included representatives of the PZPR leadership, allied parties, the government, and parliament. (W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State did not run either for the Sejm or for the Senate.)

A new sociopolitical situation has undoubtedly formed in Poland today. Its distinguishing feature is the increased influence of the opposition and particularly the "Solidarity" trade union association and the necessity for its real participation in the country's life. However bitter the results of the election may have been for the PZPR and the entire government coalition, they have really strengthened the processes of socialist renewal and radical reform which are taking place in Poland which, incidentally, are being implemented at the initiative of the PZPR. The results of the "roundtable" and the policy of national consensus were supported.

Another reality of conditions in Poland today is the fact that no single political force on its own is capable of leading the country out of the crisis. A broad front of all the forces concerned and their thorough collaboration in the name of reforms and democracy is necessary.

The representatives of the ruling coalition have informed the PZPR that they are ready to form such a front. The representatives of "Solidarity" have also agreed with the idea of pooling efforts in the process of implementing the "roundtable" agreements, although they have refused to join any kind of formal structures. A working meeting of coalition and opposition representatives has taken place. The meeting confirmed its resolve to carry out the "roundtable" decisions. A sitting of the conciliatory commission is being prepared.

The relatively low degree of activeness of the voters cannot be ignored in assessing the current situation. Millions of Poles, almost 38 percent, did not appear at the ballot boxes. There are undoubtedly various reasons for this. But I think that the apathy, weariness, and lack of faith which have a hold on part of Polish society played an important role. Here, too, there is food for thought for politicians, sociologists, economists, and all forces promoting programs of renewal and reforms.

At present there is a natural animation in the Polish political scene connected with the regrouping of power and caused by the results of the first round of the elections. Some people are analyzing the unpleasant results and are looking for their causes, while others are, as they say, reaping the fruits of their victory. But there is only one Poland, and its future is the affair of all the Poles. The mass media are turning their attention to the need to increase the feeling of responsibility on all sides and the continuation of dialogue, compromise, reforms, and consensus.

A report published in Warsaw on the sitting of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo which discussed the country's sociopolitical situation and the preliminary results of the first round of the elections has stated that the PZPR confirms the proposal on forming a broad coalition of the forces in favor of reform made by W. Jaruzelski in his election speech.

The Politburo has called on party organs and organizations, and party members to support and implement under the new conditions the social dialogue and reforms which were outlined in the resolutions of the PZPR Central Committee 10th Plenum.

The idea of democratic reforms did not lose the 4 June elections, TRYBUNA LUDU noted. A party or a coalition which launched these reforms and arranged the

"roundtable" cannot lose in the historical process. A party which has not shed its responsibility for the future and which is prepared to make even the most painful conclusions from its own mistakes cannot feel defeated, the newspaper notes.

Social Problems Continue in SFRY's Kosovo Province
PM1406163989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report on unrest in Kosovo: "Nationalists' attacks"]

[Text] Belgrade, 12 Jun—Attacks by Albanian nationalists and separatists against the social order are continuing in Kosovo Autonomous Province.

The newspaper BORBA reports today the distribution there of slanderous material and leaflets bearing the slogans "Blood for Blood" and "Kosovo—Republic."

How can the painful problem of Kosovo be solved? This question is now worrying all the working people of Yugoslavia, the paper continues. Unfortunately, the all-Yugoslav Kosovo program that has been drawn up and whose immediate aim is to put an end to the eviction of the province's indigenous inhabitants and to return Serbs and Montenegrins to their homes, is not being carried out or is being implemented too slowly. Neither the authoritative commissions arriving in Pristina, nor the coordinating committees, nor the plans drawn up by local organs to stabilize the situation are helping. This is the result of mistakes and errors made by leaders of various ranks and the consequence of poor ideological work done by the League of Communists of Kosovo, which has now begun to rid itself of fellow-travelers, careerists, opportunists, and nationalists.

D. Cvetkovic, member of the League of Communists of Serbia Central Committee Presidium, speaking last Sunday [11 June] to the aktiv of Pristina University, said that the Communists' immediate task was to purge the 100,000-member province party organization of all those who had committed mistakes in eliminating the causes leading to the flare-up of nationalist demonstrations and those who were up to their necks in double-dealing and bureaucracy.

West Europe

15 Jun Speeches by Gorbachev, Rau Published
PM1906135589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Reception in Duesseldorf"]

[Text] Bonn, 16 Jun—On 15 June J. Rau, prime minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, and his wife arranged a reception in Benrath Castle in honor of M.S. Gorbachev and his wife. At the reception J. Rau and M.S. Gorbachev exchanged speeches:

Speech By J. Rau

Most esteemed Mr General Secretary!
Esteemed Mrs Gorbacheva!
Ladies and gentlemen!

Such a program as this—an entire federal land in 6 hours.... To draw it up and accomplish it, this alone requires a special art. Particularly as our guest always goes his own way (laughter, applause) and wants to meet with people. We have seen this often in the past few days. Today's visit is to North Rhine-Westphalia. The day began in Bonn, and we came here via Dortmund. People's faces, eyes, and gestures have shown more than the words that have been uttered how important is your visit to us, Mr General Secretary.

At a time when there are still people who remember how many military bridgeheads have been built on our planet, one wants to find people who are not into bridgeheads, but are building bridges. You have become a well-known political figure worldwide, because you are known as a builder of bridges. And in this sense we cordially welcome you to North Rhine-Westphalia, at the final stage of your visit to the FRG.

North Rhine-Westphalia is a traditionally industrial land which is nonetheless undergoing constant regeneration. People here still live close to the land and to nature, but they are asking questions about future prospects.

It was in this land that the first political prerequisites were created for everything that is called Ostpolitik to become the reality that you are continuing to strenghten here, too, not only at this reception, but at meetings attended by many thousands of our people—at the "Hoescht" plant and other steel enterprises. All this was particularly gratifying for us.

We cordially welcome you, your wife, and your delegation. (Applause).

In your book, which came out here under the title "Restructuring—a Second Russian Revolution," I read: I am conveying the idea that we want a world without war, without an arms race, without nuclear weapons and violence, and not only because it would be an ideal prerequisite for our internal development, but also because it is an objective, worldwide need, arising out of real circumstances, present-day factors. The world is living in a climate of nuclear threat and oppressive social problems which are still waiting to be solved. Mankind is faced with unprecedented problems. And it will be in a position of dangerous uncertainty until common joint solutions are found. This, Mr General Secretary, applies both to East and to West. We are living in different social systems, we are living within the framework of military-political blocs which arose after World War II. We each have our own history, our own way of thinking, our own

temperament. But basically we are united in the belief that we have a common future. Not a future in which we are opposed to one another, but a joint future.

We thank you for recognizing, saying, and demonstrating this. We also recognize this, therefore we we also want to express it and also set an example. Your visit is not the end of a story, but more of a colon. The fine words must now be followed by fine deeds. Good luck to you personally and to your people. (Applause).

Speech By M.S. Gorbachev

Esteemed Mr Prime Minister and Mrs Rau!
Esteemed members of the North Rhine-Westphalia Land government!
Ladies and gentlemen, comrades, and friends!

We, our delegation, have been very touched by the hospitality and warmth we have met with here, on your soil. We thank you for this.

We particularly cherish this desire for friendship with us in this area, where millions of people work and with which we have had close cooperation links for a long time. It was very pleasant for us to be able to participate in the magnificent meeting with members of the working class in Dortmund, to feel again the full power of worker solidarity with restructuring, with the Soviet people's deeds.

I agree with Mr Rau that, of course, both important words and important decisions are needed. But it is even more important that these words and decisions should always be followed by specific deeds. Working people and business circles in your land are pioneers in the establishment and development of cooperation with the Soviet Union. And much of what the skilled hands have accomplished at your enterprises is today operating successfully and well for the benefit of Soviet people. We thank you for that.

I hope that you, too, are conscious of the fruits of the labor of our people, working class, and, above all, those who extract gas, oil, and other raw materials which are so vital to industry and to people. One must live by working together and deriving common benefit from work. Much has been said about this during the visit. What we are doing together today is fine. But, to be honest, it is not enough. Our countries' potential is vast, and we could double, even treble the scale of economic cooperation.

Perhaps the most important thing we will take home after this brief, but very important visit to your country is new impressions and new knowledge of the FRG people's sentiments. We highly value the manifest feelings of respect, the desire to cooperate, the wish to trust one another more, tackle common problems together, and meet one another half-way.

It seems to me it is the more crucial and important prerequisite for politicians' activity: Because a politician, if he is a real politician and not someone who is in politics under false pretences, must know his people's feelings and their desires and try to carry them out in his activity. We will take away with us the belief that today the FRG and FRG politicians understand the imperatives of the times and sense, as we do, the wishes of their people. We felt this during the very intensive and detailed conversations and talks with your president, Mr von Weizsaecker, and with Chancellor Kohl, with both of whom I have established good personal contacts. I and my comrades in the delegation felt this during numerous meetings with leaders of political parties. We felt it yesterday, in Stuttgart. And we feel it just as much now we are in North Rhine-Westphalia at the invitation of your prime minister and your government.

All this is very important. It allows us to hope for better things in our relations. I would like to congratulate you, FRG citizens, and Soviet people on the fact that we are embarking on the broad highway of new cooperation, reaching a new level in our relations. Let us meet one another half-way. We will get there. Thank you. (Applause).

PRAVDA Ponders Results of Gorbachev's Visit

PM1906153589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Cooperation in the Name of Peace. Pondering the Results of the FRG Visit"]

[Text] The 12-15 June official visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the FRG was a major event in Soviet-West German relations and in European and world politics. It crowned the great, patient work done in both countries to surmount the obstacles of the past and made it possible to raise our states' cooperation to a new level of trust.

An important result of the visit was the signing of the joint statement. Revealing the prospects for future cooperation in the context of the contemporary processes in Europe and in the world, this unique political document is a graphic embodiment of the new thinking and of the ability of states such as the USSR and the FRG, which are different in terms of their world outlook and political orientation, to follow the same path and to coordinate their policies on fundamental issues on whose resolution the security and well-being not only of their own peoples but also of all mankind depend.

The joint statement develops the concept of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems and fills it with new substance. It confirms in practice that under the historic new conditions such states can not just live in peace with each other but also cooperate actively in resolving problems that go beyond a particular social system. These include defending human rights

and dignity, ensuring peace and well-being for all countries and peoples, creating guarantees in international law for the free choice of their paths of development and for the prevention of war in any form whatever, protecting the natural environment, turning the achievements of modern economics, science, and technology to people's advantage, and struggling together against new dangers, including epidemics and international terrorism.

The Soviet Union and the FRG see it as their priority political task to help surmount the disunity of Europe by relying on the historically evolved European traditions. They expressed determination jointly to seek paths leading to the creation of a Europe of peace and cooperation—a peaceful European system and a common European home in which there is room for the United States and Canada. Outlining specific areas in which the building of such a Europe must be developed, the two states' leaders emphasized that they not only do not think of acting on this matter in isolation from others but, on the contrary, reckon on the most active and creative participation of all interested countries and peoples.

It is perfectly obvious that the role of the USSR and the FRG in advancing the positive processes in the European and world arena that they have pledged to uphold will depend, above all, on the strength and dynamism of their own cooperation. And the most paramount attention was devoted to this. The participants in the talks on the banks of the Rhine stated that the positive development of Soviet-West German relations is of central significance for Europe and for East-West relations as a whole. Determination was expressed to continue developing them and to impart still greater stability and strength to them.

These are not just words. As is known, in addition to the joint statement more than 10 other intergovernmental documents were signed, which still further broadened the treaty base of Soviet-West German relations. It was pointed out that these relations, which were founded on the Moscow Treaty of 12 August 1970, must assume the nature of partnership cooperation in all spheres on the basis of trust, equality of rights, and mutual advantage.

The further development and improvement of economic cooperation was discussed both at the talks in Bonn and at the meetings in other cities.

People in the FRG perceived with great interest the new ideas and proposals contained in M.S. Gorbachev's speech to representatives of the country's business circles, in which he urged West German businessmen to seek new forms of mutually advantageous economic ties, including placing orders with Soviet scientific institutes, making commercial use of Soviet space technology, participating in the assimilation of the production capacities released for production of peaceful output as a result of the military industry's conversion, and much else.

Speaking in principle, a considerable number of agreements and accords between the two countries have to be filled with specific businesslike substance. Today it is chiefly a matter of fulfilling them and proceeding from talk of readiness for mutual cooperation to practical steps. And here it has to be said that, in addition to such obstacles in the way of the rapid expansion of trade and economic exchanges between the two countries as the "restrictive lists" of the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls or, sometimes, the desire of West German firms to secure unilateral advantages when concluding deals, the Soviet side too must accept part of the blame.

Speaking on West German television during the visit, the chairman of the board of the Deutsche Bank said that of the DM3 billion in credits allocated by a consortium of FRG banks for the modernization of Soviet light industry and the food industry in October 1988 so far just DM350 million has in fact been used. Negotiations are being conducted on credits worth a total of DM1.6 billion, and the remaining funds to the tune of more than DM1 billion have not yet been claimed at all. Far from everything is well in the work of joint ventures, too. Many of them, including the machine-building firm Khomatek [name as transliterated], the pioneer of Soviet-West German cooperation, are experiencing difficulties associated with muddle, fear of responsibility, and other defects in the work of individual Soviet departments. Specialists and businessmen on both sides rightly raise the question of instilling order, including the creation of structures which could assume full responsibility and would possess the necessary organizational, financial, and legal potential for resolving the questions that arise.

The Soviet guests were received with exceptional warmth and amicability at all levels and in all the FRG cities on their itinerary. The FRG mass media unanimously pointed out that the West Germans have not given a single foreign guest such a rapturous welcome for several decades. A lively and sincere interest in the policy of restructuring in our country and in the USSR's humane domestic and foreign policy lay at the basis of this amicability. FRG residents, like all people on earth, are tired of the "cold war." They want changes, and so they welcome our country's policy of new thinking, which is opening up a real hope for the creation of a world without wars. A world founded on equality, mutual respect, and cooperation.

It was precisely this atmosphere of new hopes and strengthening mutual understanding and trust that the visit reflected. By raising cooperation between two such influential states as the USSR and the FRG to a still higher level, it has ushered in a new stage in European history.

European Comment on Gorbachev's Bonn Visit Cited
PM2006101389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Roundup of PRAVDA own and TASS correspondents' reports for 16 June on reaction to Gorbachev FRG trip: "Thinking About the Future of Mankind"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev's news conference before leaving Bonn and the documents signed during the visit are widely commented on by the media and by political and public figures in East and West.

Berlin—The GDR sees M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG as an outstanding contribution to maintaining and stabilizing peace in Europe, GDR Foreign Ministry spokesman V. Meyer said. The new quality of relations between the USSR and the FRG achieved as a result of the visit is the outcome of long years of efforts by the Soviet Union and its allies.

The GDR supports the aims and principles of preserving peace, disarmament, and detente in the manner in which they are formulated by M.S. Gorbachev and H. Kohl in the joint statement, since they accord with the aims of the republic's own policy. It shares the belief that concern for mankind's survival should be at the center of every policy. War is no longer a political means, and one cannot safeguard one's own security at others' expense. The GDR endorses condemnation of the desire for military superiority and welcomes the document's stance on deepening and developing the disarmament process, the GDR Foreign Ministry representative stressed.

The GDR attaches special significance to the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and security of every state, the recognition of the right of all countries to freely choose their own social system, the observance of international legal norms, the radical reduction of conventional armaments, and the elimination of all short-range nuclear systems and chemical weapons. This is a vital task of the present and the future, V. Meyer noted.

Sofia—The Bulgarian papers have stressed the exceptional importance of Soviet-West German dialogue for the establishment of new political thinking in the international arena, for strengthening the course toward security, mutual understanding, and cooperation in Europe and in the world in general.

A comprehensive analysis and in-depth assessment of the results will be given later, but one can say right away that the visit will go down in world history as an example of vigorous and fruitful political dialogue, RABOTNICHESKO DELO writes.

In the joint statement they signed the USSR and FRG displayed responsibility in assessing the past, in which there have been good times and tragedies, ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME notes. The document is a new word in relations between two major European powers with complex historical links. Present-day political thinking is properly reflected in this dialogue.

Washington—In a report from Bonn an ABC television correspondent reported: "After several decades of suspicion and distrust between the two countries Mikhail Gorbachev took advantage of his final news conference to strengthen the new image of the Soviet Union as a partner and not as a threat. After his meeting with journalists the Soviet leader went on an experimental high-speed train to an industrial area in the Ruhr Valley to promote the development of trade and economic links between the two countries. He was again greeted with a tumultuous ovation—this time from steelworkers. It is further confirmation of the fact that Gorbachev's pronouncements are making their mark."

Warsaw—The Soviet leader's visit to the FRG, TRYBUNA LUDU notes, has led to a significant qualitative improvement in relations and in the prospects of long-term USSR-FRG cooperation and has demonstrated their joint will to create a common European home. According to the paper, the visit was a great intellectual and political fillip for all Europeans and made them take a new look at the architecture of their common home in the third millennium. The significance of the event extends beyond the confines of Soviet-West German relations, ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI points out. The FRG inhabitants' ardent reception for the important Soviet visitor was symbolic in that respect.

Paris—The visit to the FRG by leader of the CPSU and Soviet state was entirely successful, a TF-1 television channel announcer stated. The impression is that for the USSR the FRG plays a "leading diplomatic role" in the normalization of relations between East and West. As for Soviet-West German relations, the joint agreements signed in Bonn should have a significant influence on their future development.

Urging a careful study of the visit's results, the paper LIBERATION writes: "Henceforth all countries will draw their own conclusions concerning the common European home idea to which M.S. Gorbachev and H. Kohl showed such striking dedication."

In the FRG all representatives of business circles have agreed in principle to sharply intensify economic relations with their Soviet partners, but there are considerable difficulties in the way of the practical implementation of their wishes, TRIBUNE DE L'EXPANSION states.

Visit Called 'Landmark Event' in FRG-USSR Relations
PM1906112989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 89 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev, A. Maslennikov, I. Melnikov reportage: "Pooling Efforts"]

[Text] Bonn 15 Jun—And so the official visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the

FRG has ended. A news conference held by the Soviet leader here today provided the political finale of the visit.

Several hundred representatives of the world press, radio, and television gathered in the international press center. The large hall could not hold everyone who wanted to ask questions and obtain firsthand elaborations on the problems featuring on the bulky agenda of the talks in Bonn. The first official visit abroad of M.S. Gorbachev as the newly elected head of the Soviet state became an important milestone in the development of Soviet-West German relations and an event in European and world politics. By general admission, it raised the mutual understanding between the two countries, which had strengthened of late, to a new level and—and this is especially important—it introduced many new elements into the interpretation of the problems facing the peoples of Europe and the whole world and mapped out realistic paths for the collaboration of states belonging to different social systems and military-political alliances.

The joint statement signed during the visit records for the first time in history the joint political and philosophical approaches which the two major world powers intend to follow as a guideline. The Soviet Union and the FRG have pledged to act jointly in the interests of peace, cooperation, prevention of all military conflicts, safeguarding the right of all people to the freedom of choice of their path of development, protection of the environment, elimination of hunger and poverty on the planet, and combating epidemics, terrorism, and other dangers threatening mankind.

The authors of the statement note that the fundamental issues facing mankind today can only be resolved jointly by all states and peoples and that no one must build their own security at the expense of the security of others. The Soviet Union and the FRG regard overcoming the disunity of Europe and jointly seeking paths which will lead to the creation of a continent of peace and cooperation, a peaceful European system, a common European home in which there will be room for the United States and Canada, as the paramount task of their policy.

They favor an end to the arms race, the reduction of Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms by 50 percent, the achievement of progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, the establishment of a stable and reliable equilibrium in conventional arms at a lower level, and other disarmament and arms control measures.

It is particularly significant that this document has come into being as a result of the ongoing development of relations of mutual understanding and cooperation between such states as the Soviet Union and the FRG. There is no need to recall the complex political and psychological vicissitudes through which Soviet-West German relations passed before reaching their current level.

Tremendous efforts and major changes in the international arena as well as in the policy of our two states themselves were needed in order to embark on the path of good neighborliness the groundwork for which was laid by the Moscow Treaty. In recent years the restructuring and democratization in the Soviet Union and the active implementation by our country of the policy of new thinking in the international arena have had a particularly beneficial and fruitful impact on our relations.

The FRG is not just our biggest trade partner among Western countries now, it is also a state to which we are linked by probably the densest network of intergovernmental agreements, business contracts, and cooperation accords in the most varied spheres, ranging from the economy to partnership ties between cities and exchange visits by cultural, scientific, and religious figures. In the course of the visit new bricks were laid on the foundations of firm trust in the edifice of cooperation, and accords that had been achieved earlier were filled with new, businesslike content. This is borne out by the treaty on the protection of capital investments, the agreement on the establishment of a direct communication line between the Kremlin and the Federal Chancellor's Office in Bonn, the agreement on more profound cooperation in the training and further training of specialists and leading cadres in the sphere of economy, and a number of other agreements that were signed by the leaders of the two countries' appropriate departments.

An important characteristic of the current stage of Soviet-West German relations is the fact that the desire to get to understand each other better, to find a common language and practical means of resolving problems is not limited to the upper echelons of power and professional politicians and representatives of the business world. The warm and at times rapturous welcome afforded to the Soviet leader in the streets and squares of West German cities and the public opinion polls, in which M.S. Gorbachev invariably scored more points than any Western leader, were a graphic illustration that the policy of rapprochement and cooperation with the USSR has the support of the overwhelming majority of the population.

To be fair, it must be noted that this policy is being directly linked here with the personal qualities of the Soviet leader. "Why this enthusiasm?" F. Kemna, chief editor of the newspaper GENERAL-ANZEIGER, asks and replies: "He, a Communist, embodies for countless young people in the West the virtues which they do not find in their own elected politicians. Truthfulness, honesty, and courage, to be specific. He conveys the new image of present-day Russia." "He has a talent for friendship," a young person in Bonn said. All this has made it possible for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to further increase his popularity during his several days in Bonn and trips around the republic. This causes some people concern, but this concern, which may be partially justified, is by no means detracting from these sympathies.

We have managed to learn from the federal chancellor's entourage that the results of the visit are rated highly in these circles and that the visit is regarded as an important stage in the development of relations between our two countries. The visit, we were told, has really opened a new chapter in our relations and laid the foundations for their further positive development. The joint statement signed in Bonn is an important complement to the Moscow Treaty which was and remains the basis of the relations between our two countries.

The FRG leadership is, of course, well aware that by no means all the problems have been resolved, our Bonn interlocutors went on. And that is natural. After all, we belong to different systems and not all our differences can be resolved in one fell swoop. However, we are trying to meet each other half-way, united by a common commitment to ensuring peace and further progress in the disarmament sphere. And that is a good basis for our joint efforts.

During the past few days, our interlocutors said, the whole world was looking at Bonn. The first international reactions seem highly favorable. Naturally some people are also expressing misgivings, but these lack all foundation.

We would like to add on our part that the people who talked to us thought it preferable not to elaborate on the aforementioned reservations, but it was obvious to us what was meant. Throughout the 4 days of the visit, in the course of press conferences and private conversations, some of our Western colleagues were persistently harping on some kind of "secret designs" on the part of the Soviet Union aimed at "causing a rift in the Western alliance" or at the very least "weakening Western solidarity." The answer to these far-fetched "fears" was given both during public statements by the talks participants and in the documents which they signed. The joint statement of the USSR and the FRG, M.S. Gorbachev said addressing his West German partners, "does not demand from either you or us that we renounce our nature or weaken our alliance ties. On the contrary, I am convinced that the application of this statement in our policies will serve to boost the contribution of each of the states to the development of a peaceful order in Europe and the formation of an all-European consciousness."

Special attention at the international press center—"the fountainhead of news"—was focused on the question of the approach of the participants in the Bonn dialogue to problems of disarmament. And among these problems, naturally, on the fate of tactical nuclear weapons, in view of the extremely heated debate on this theme in FRG political circles, and especially among the public. The joint statement outlines the main trends and objectives of both sides' efforts in the sphere of disarmament. This will give considerable impetus to this process.

However, as one British woman journalist noted, the situation concerning tactical nuclear weapons remains "vague" as there is no mention of these weapons in the statement. The official West German spokesman tried to explain this by references to the "inappropriateness" of discussing this question at bilateral talks since it concerns several states at once, although this is constantly being done during bilateral meetings between NATO country leaders.

Frankly speaking, most journalists found this explanation unsatisfactory. It rather created the impression that Bonn wants to "suppress this topical theme and sidestep its discussion." Claims that the FRG's position on this problem is "identical with NATO's" are even more ambiguous, since, as is well known, the circles which set the tone in NATO favor the preservation and modernization of the tactical nuclear weapons currently in the bloc's arsenal as an essential component of the policy of nuclear deterrence [sderzhivaniye].

Meanwhile it is becoming more and more obvious that a peaceful order in Europe calls for the containment [sderzhivaniye] of nuclear weapons rather than nuclear deterrence [sderzhivaniye], or better still the elimination of these weapons. The question of the total elimination of tactical nuclear means cannot be taken off the agenda. There is simply no logical reason for postponing talks on tactical nuclear weapons.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG was truly a landmark event in the relations between our countries and an important contribution to the cause of peace, stability, and mutual understanding on the European continent. It has contributed to the deepening of mutual understanding between two major European states and the coordination of their efforts in the interests of European and world peace.

...The official farewell ceremony for the Soviet guest was held at the residence of the federal president in Bonn. However, it did not mark the end of the visit. Its finale today was the truly rapturous—there is no other word to describe it—meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and workers at the "Hoescht" metallurgical plant in Dortmund. It was an amazingly vivid event. A magnificent climax to the visit.

The encounters with the inhabitants of Bonn and working people in Stuttgart and Dortmund testify better than any words that our peoples are ready to meet each other half-way.

'Majority' of FRG Citizens View USSR Favorably

AU1306134689

[Editorial Report] Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German on 12 June publishes an article on an opinion poll carried out in Moscow and the FRG on restructuring, the

Soviets, and the Germans, and an interview with Moscow pollster Elena Bashkirova, who headed the team of scientists that prepared the DER SPIEGEL opinion poll at the Institute for Sociology of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The 2,500-word article on pages 34-42, entitled "Trust Instead of Missiles?" about the opinion poll stresses at the beginning that the Germans and the Soviets like each other more than in the past, but that they have remained rather unfamiliar with each other. "Only 3 out of every 100 Moscovites have been to the FRG," whereas "10 out of 100 FRG citizens have been to the Soviet Union." The opinion poll shows a high degree of ignorance on both sides concerning political and cultural figures. "Many FRG citizens have never heard the names of Gorbachev's opponents, of the radical reformer Yeltsin and the opponent to the reforms, Ligachev, on the right side of the Moscow spectrum."

The opinion poll suggests that "an open and even liberal atmosphere prevails in Moscow." It also shows that "young people in the Soviet Union are less conformist" than people in the West generally think. "Young Muscovites are critical or even rebellious. This also applies to Gorbachev's reform course. Only 39 percent of the Muscovites aged between 18 and 30 support his course unconditionally, but 62 percent of those aged between 45 and 60, and as much as 78 percent of retirees do."

"One focal point of the opinion poll was the attitude of FRG citizens toward the United States and the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, U.S. concern that the FRG might turn toward the East or at least strive for a neutral center position between the two superpowers has been growing as a result of Gorbachev's impact," the article points out.

"There is no longer such a contrast between likable Americans and unlikable Russians" that was still noted in 1981. "FRG citizens no longer feel so closely linked with the United States as they used to, and they no longer view the Soviet Union as an archenemy. Within a few years's time, the majority of Germans have abandoned their unfavorable view of the Soviet Union (1982: 77 percent) and adopted a more positive opinion (1989: 73 percent)."

"The United States is still rated higher than the Soviet Union. This picture changes as soon as specific issues such as disarmament, missiles, and other types of weapons are concerned."

In connection with the peace and disarmament policy of the two superpowers, the opinion poll reveals that "the FRG citizens have more confidence in Moscow than in Washington. In addition to that, the number of FRG citizens who believe that the Soviet Union's military goal is to achieve a balance and not superiority is higher than the number of citizens who believe U.S. policy is aimed at this."

The 4,000-word interview with Elena Bashkirova on pages 44-54, entitled "Learning To Have an Opinion of One's Own," concentrates mainly on the results of the opinion poll carried out on behalf of DER SPIEGEL in Moscow. Asked what result surprised her most, Elena Bashkirova states that it is the replies to the question about a multiparty system. "There have been considerable changes in this respect. Whereas previously 51 percent supported a one-party system, the figure has now dropped to 28 percent. This means that there is a tendency among the Moscow population to call for a multiparty system," she points out.

Asked why only about 40 percent support Gorbachev's reform course partially, she points out that "some do not consider the pace of reform fast enough. They share the view of the former Moscow party chief Yeltsin. Others mainly see the unresolved supply situation."

Elena Bashkirova also stresses that some time ago it would have been impossible to ask the questions asked during this opinion poll. "We did not require a censorship body because we imposed restrictions on ourselves. We had an internal censorship in our minds. We did not have the courage to face conflicts."

FRG Company To Supply Computers to USSR

LD1606192189 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to West Germany has promoted new possibilities in expansion of the USSR's economic, scientific and technological relations with the FRG.

An agreement between the West German Siemens company, the British firm Afro-Arab, the Moscow Orbita Production Association and the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of the Russian Federation was signed at the Sovincentre today.

The USSR will be supplied with contemporary computers, service centres will be formed and Orbita employees will undergo training at Siemens technical centres in accordance with the agreement.

The Siemens company did its bit in the history of cooperation with Russia as far back as in 1848 when it established telegraph communication line between Petersburg and Kronshtadt.

The two sides will exchange delegations on the basis of scientific research institutes of the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of the Russian Federation, Siemens specialists will participate in research and developments and in streamlining telecommunication systems.

In the first stage of joint activities it is planned not only to supply computers, but also to assemble them and telefax, telephone, radio systems and video equipment will be made in the USSR somewhat later.

Speaking to journalists, Siemens Vice-President R. Holler noted the importance of the agreement for further improvement of East-West relations.

USSR Ship 'Maksim Gorkiy' Hits Iceberg 19 Jun

All Passengers, Crew Rescued

LD2006095889 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The Soviet cruise liner Maksim Gorkiy was holed after hitting an iceberg 220 kilometers from Spitsbergen on Monday [19 June] night, the Soviet Foreign Ministry reported. The vessel, belonging to the Black Sea shipping company, was on charter to the West German tourist firm Fenix Flugreisen.

The Maksim Gorkiy was carrying 575 passengers and 377 Soviet crew. All the tourists and crewmen, except the rescue team, have been picked up by lifeboats and rafts and are being evacuated to Spitsbergen by Norwegian coast guard vessels, as well as Soviet and Norwegian helicopters. The situation is fully under the control of the Soviet and Norwegian rescue teams which are working in close harmony.

No casualties have been reported.

The accident damaged the ship's hull. The vessel was bow-heavy and the rescue team is taking efforts to ensure its survivability.

Cruise Ship 'Dangerously Listing'

LD2006140289 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Oslo June 20 TASS—The situation on board the Soviet cruise ship "Maksim Gorkiy", which collided last night with an iceberg in the Barents Sea west of the Spitsbergen archipelago, remains tense. It has been further aggravated by the shut-down of a powerful pump that helped drain the sea water from the hull.

The ship is still dangerously listing. It is expected that two new pumps will shortly be delivered from Longyear, the administrative centre of Spitsbergen.

By noon today all the tourists and some of the crew had been transferred to the Norwegian coast guard vessel Senja. Helicopters have begun airlifting them to Longyear.

Two hundred and fifty crew members have remained on board the Maksim Gorkiy to try and keep the ship afloat. The ship's captain has refused to continue the evacuation.

An underwater inspection of the ship carried out by Norwegian divers has shown that the collision with the Iceberg left two jagged holes in the ship's side, one measuring 2.5 meters in length and 0.75 meters in width, the other one is much narrower by up to six meters in length.

The captain of the Norwegian ship has declined to comment on possible consequences but pointed out that two new pumps will stop further listing long enough for the holes to be patched up.

Paper Notes 'Successful' Polish-UK Talks in London

PM1406104589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent A. Krivopalov dispatch: "For the First Time Since the War"]

[Text] London—The visit by General W. Jaruzelski, chairman of the Polish People's Republic Council of State, to Britain is over. This was the first top-level visit here by a Polish leader since World War II.

According to both sides' assessments, the talks held between W. Jaruzelski and M. Thatcher were successful. Britain's prime minister promised to support the Polish People's Republic in relations with the EEC and with Western countries in general. The specific steps which can be expected from London in the near future include assistance to the Polish People's Republic in revising the schedules for the repayment of its financial obligations to the IMF and the "Paris Club."

The British Government promised to implement a 25 million pounds sterling 5-year aid program for Poland. It provides for the training of managers and the elaboration of recommendations for the development of market relations in the country's economy.

A. Clark, British minister of state for trade, is due to travel to Warsaw to study the possibility of British capital investments there. Official London is willing to act through the EEC to ensure that restrictions are lifted on the sale of Polish goods in "Common Market" countries.

During a meeting with journalists, W. Jaruzelski declared that he is confident that the Polish United Workers Party "is capable of strengthening its position on the Polish political map." The high-ranking visitor from the Polish People's Republic honored the memory of General W. Sikorski, prime minister of the Polish government in exile in 1939-1943, by visiting his grave at the cemetery in Newark.

Assessing the visit's results, W. Jaruzelski noted in an interview with THE GUARDIAN the "warm atmosphere" at the talks with the British leadership. "I especially value this visit because it took place at a difficult time for Poland," he emphasized.

Greek Ambassador Presents Credentials to Lukyanov

LD1506213289 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—Illas Gounaris, the ambassador of the Hellenic Republic to the Soviet Union, presented his credentials to Anatoliy Lukyanov, first vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet and alternate member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, in the Kremlin today.

Gounaris spoke highly of Greek-Soviet relations which may serve as an example to countries belonging to different social systems.

All Greek people, he said, now follow with great interest the Soviet Union's advance along the road of perestroyka and wish it every success.

The ambassador pointed out the importance of positive changes in the development of East-West relations, expressing hope for a substantial progress in the business of reducing nuclear and conventional arsenals and finally ending the arms race.

Lukyanov pointed to a high degree of mutual understanding within the framework of the Soviet-Greek political dialogue, which manifests itself in the practice of exchanges of messages between the leaders of the two countries.

The participation of Greece in the activities of the intercontinental six-country group and its efforts towards creating in the Balkans a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons have earned Greece a great international prestige.

Satisfaction with the certain easing of tensions in the Eastern Mediterranean as a result of emerging tendencies towards an improvement of Greek-Turkish relations and the search for ways to settle the Cyprus issue was expressed.

Soviet, Swiss Officials Meet in Moscow

PM1306152189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 11

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 7 June a meeting took place in the USSR Foreign Ministry between V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and F. Blankart [name as published], secretary of state of the Swiss Federal Department of the Economy and chief of the Federal Department of Foreign Economic Relations.

New Soviet-Portuguese Trade Plans Outlined

PM1606102989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent L. Kostanyan dispatch: "A Boost to Trade"]

[Text] Lisbon—A series of important trade and economic documents were signed in Lisbon on the eve of the 15th anniversary of Soviet-Portuguese diplomatic relations, which is to be marked soon.

Let me begin with the Soviet-Portuguese protocol which maps out ways for the development of trade and economic ties between the two countries. Both sides have serious intentions of giving reciprocal exchanges a substantial boost following several adverse years. "One could speak of a new page in our relations"—that was the opinion expressed after the signing of the protocol by Horta e Costa, Portugal's secretary of state for foreign trade.

Yu. Chumakov, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic ties, who appended his signature to the protocol, said that the new documents are not just a replacement of old ones. Both sides have now agreed to seek and develop new avenues of cooperation without abandoning traditional forms. For example, a motor vehicle assembly plant could be created now in Portugal with participation by the Soviet side. Opportunities are opening up to organize mixed enterprises, specifically for the production of press molds, the preparation of agar (a raw material for the medical and food industries), and the manufacture of a whole series of industrial rubber products which would require the use of our synthetic rubber and Portuguese cork. We intend, Yu. Chumakov went on, to expand the established forms of cooperation, primarily in shipbuilding. Portugal has proved to be a sound partner, while we need to increase our orders for the building, repair, and servicing of ships.

The signing of this protocol was followed by the signing of an agreement translating these ideas into specific projects. The agreement is qualitatively different from previous ones: Using the "Vneshtekhnika" All-Union Foreign Trade Association as intermediary, the All-Union Chemical and Pharmaceutical Scientific Research Institute sold the local firm "Quatrum" two licenses for the production of steroid hormonal compounds using pulp and paper industry waste. That was the institute's first venture in the foreign market and the firm's first attempt at cooperation with Soviet colleagues; it was also our country's first sale of Soviet technology to Portugal.

What lies ahead? We expect, institute director Academician R. Glushkov of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences said, to set up a joint enterprise in Portugal in cooperation with the same firm, applying our technological processes and producing hormonal compounds which are very widely used in world medicine to treat inflammation processes, dermatitis, and allergy complaints.

Sakharov Arrives in Netherlands 15 Jun

LD1606043789 Moscow TASS in English 0432 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] The Hague June 16 TASS—Soviet Academician Andrey Sakharov arrived in the Netherlands on Thursday [15 June] to receive an honourary doctorate in law from the University of Groningen, one of the country's oldest higher educational establishments.

The ceremony, which will be held today, has been timed to coincide with the 375th anniversary of the university's foundation.

Upon his arrival at Amsterdam's Schiphol Airport, Sakharov answered reporters' questions about the recent Congress of USSR People's Deputies in Moscow and its results.

Moscow-Supported Turkish Radio Ceases Broadcasts

NC1406073689 Istanbul HURRIYET in Turkish 9 Jun 89 p 12

[Excerpt] (HURRIYET Foreign News Service)—"Our Radio," which has been accused of being "Moscow's mouthpiece" in criticizing the Turkish Government, will end its 31 years of broadcasting on Monday, 12 June 1989. The decision to close down Our Radio was disclosed in a press bulletin issued yesterday by the United Information Center, which is regarded as the United Turkish Communist Party's news agency. The bulletin said: "Turkey is becoming a democratic regime. The Marxists in Turkey have reached a communal legality which cannot be taken back. A historic era is now ending. Our Radio's operations have served their purpose."

Observers have linked the closure of Our Radio, which was established during the years when the cold war was at its peak, to the emergence of a "spring atmosphere" in East-West relations. This atmosphere is due to changing conditions in the Soviet Union. The observers assessed the development as "a positive gesture from Moscow to Ankara."

Asked whether or not the closure of Our Radio was due to present relations between Ankara and Moscow, First Under Secretary [Birinci Mustesar] of the USSR Embassy in Ankara Walter Shoniya said: "Our Radio is not our radio. What does this have to do with us?"

Although the Soviet Union has reiterated that it has no links with Our Radio, political observers have asserted that the radio has been standing on its feet with the support it has been receiving from Moscow for many years. [passage omitted]

Latin America & Carribbean

Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Brazil 13-19 Jun

Brazil's Sarney Receives Vorotnikov

LD1406135589 Moscow TASS in English 1202 GMT 14 Jun 89

[Text] Brasilia June 14 TASS—President of Brazil Jose Sarney has favoured further development of all-round cooperation between Brazil and the Soviet Union.

The policy, being conducted by the Soviet leadership, enjoys broad recognition, President Sarney said, receiving a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and president of the Presidium of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet.

A broad exchange of opinions on the most important questions of the present and bilateral relations was held.

Vorotnikov handed over to Jose Sarney a personal message from Mikhail Gorbachev. The president of Brazil expressed profound gratitude for the message and highly appreciated it. He warmly recalled the memorable meetings he held in Moscow in the course of his official visit to the USSR last October and negotiations with the Soviet leader.

Vorotnikov dwelt in detail on the course of perestroika in the Soviet Union and the Congress of Soviet People's Deputies that ended a few days ago. He underlined the significance of the USSR's foreign policy course based on the new political thinking.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation is on an official friendly visit to Brazil at the invitation of its national congress.

Vorotnikov Visits Congress

PM1606104389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation's Stay in Brazil"]

[Text] Brasilia, 13 Jun—The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is here on an official friendly visit paid a visit to Brazil's National Congress, where it met with N. Carneiro, chairman of the National Congress and Federal Senate, and P. de Andrade, chairman of the Chamber of Deputies.

On the delegation's behalf V.I. Vorotnikov thanked the National Congress leadership for the invitation to visit Brazil. During the lively conversation which took place,

the Soviet parliamentarians talked about the reform of the political system in the Soviet Union and the work of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The head of the Soviet delegation passed on to the National Congress the Message of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to the Peoples of the World, and also an official invitation to visit the Soviet Union. It was accepted with thanks.

On the same day the Soviet delegation was invited to a plenary session of the Senate. The Brazilian senators who spoke there warmly welcomed the Soviet parliamentarians and showed keen interest in the policy of radical reforms in the USSR and of the new thinking in foreign affairs. The speakers were unanimously in favor of developing Soviet-Brazilian relations in all spheres, particularly stressing the importance of interparliamentary ties.

The members of the National Congress highly assessed the fact that Brazil is the first country to be visited by an official delegation of the new USSR Supreme Soviet. They regard this as an indication of the great significance which the Soviet Union attaches to relations not only with Brazil, but also with Latin America as a whole.

For parliamentarians of all countries, N. Carneiro, speaking at the session, indicated there is just one language of communication—this is the language of dialogue called upon to eliminate all obstacles on the path of strengthening peace and international security. The threat of war can be averted and all divergences overcome only on this basis.

V.I. Vorotnikov delivered a speech in reply. He said in particular:

Our visit is the logical continuation of parliamentary contacts, which intrinsically strengthen the network of mutual accords and business and political consultations and help mutual understanding.

The Soviet Union is a principled advocate of ensuring mankind's survival in the nuclear-space age, curtailing the arms race, solving global problems, and creating a climate of trust and cooperation. We regard common human values as truly universal factors which can unite all peoples in the struggle to build a safe future on the basis of respect for both national interests and aspirations, and also for generally accepted democratic norms of international contact. In this connection we value highly the fact that the ideas of partnership, good-neighborliness and love of peace are embodied in Brazil's new constitution.

We, the leader of the Soviet delegation noted, have come to your superb country on a mission of friendship. We think that the exchange of opinions on a broad range of international problems which both countries are attempting to solve in similar or coinciding ways will lend fresh impetus to our cooperation in the struggle for peace, disarmament, and fair international political and economic relations.

The Supreme Soviet delegation visited J. Ner. da Silveira, chairman of the Federal Supreme Court.

After this it met with Brazilian Foreign Minister R. Sodre. During the meeting there was an exchange of opinions on the most important contemporary questions and bilateral relations. The Soviet leadership's present course has essentially opened up a new stage in modern history, R. Sodre noted. Stressing that there are still many unsolved problems and seats of tension in the world, at the same time he focused attention primarily on the appearance in world affairs of qualitatively positive new tendencies which inspire a sense of confidence and optimism.

It is a great honor for us, the minister indicated, to welcome from the USSR such a representative parliamentary delegation whose visit will undoubtedly help to strengthen all-round and mutually advantageous cooperation between the USSR and Brazil. I am sure that by uniting our efforts in various spheres, we will be able to move more quickly along the path of progress. The minister particularly noted the importance of joint efforts in the struggle for peace and stressed that it was precisely the Soviet Union's policy which led to the present relaxation of international tension.

The world has indeed now breathed a sigh of relief, V.I. Vorotnikov said. Disarmament has commenced, but we are still only at the beginning of the road, and it is important, despite all the difficulties, to continue the emerging dynamics. Not only governments but also parliaments have an important role to play in this.

The head of the Soviet delegation stressed the Soviet Union's openness for broad dialogue, indicating the two countries' huge potential to develop all-round Soviet-Brazilian ties.

The members of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation met with officials of Soviet institutions in Brazil. In the evening of the same day a reception was given in the delegation's honor on behalf of the leadership of Brazil's National Congress.

Vorotnikov Addresses Congress

PM1606123189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation's Stay in Brazil"]

[Text] Brasilia, 14 Jun—President Jose Sarney of Brazil has received the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian

Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium. It is paying an official friendly visit to Brazil at the invitation of the National Congress of Brazil.

V.I. Vorotnikov handed J. Sarney a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev. The Brazilian president expressed profound gratitude for the message and rated it highly. He warmly recalled his memorable meetings in Moscow during his official visit to the USSR last October and his talks with the Soviet leader. During the conversation there was a wide exchange of opinions on very important questions of the present day and bilateral relations.

V.I. Vorotnikov described in detail the course of restructuring in the Soviet Union and the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which ended recently. He particularly singled out the significance of the foreign policy course being pursued by the USSR on the basis of the new political thinking.

President Sarney declared that the policy pursued by the Soviet leadership enjoys wide recognition and advocated the further development of all-around cooperation and relations between Brazil and the Soviet Union.

On the same day the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation participated in an enlarged joint session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. Addressing the assembled people, V.I. Vorotnikov said:

First of all, allow me, on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, to express sincere gratitude to the National Congress for the invitation to visit your fine country. During our stay here, we are seeing for ourselves the profound feelings of mutual liking which our peoples have for each other. In this context the meetings of Soviet and Brazilian parliamentarians serve still greater mutual understanding. Guided by a respectful attitude toward special features of social development, we seek to penetrate the essence of the tasks being resolved by our countries and also to cooperate in achieving the supreme goal—ensuring mankind's peaceful future.

We are impressed by Brazil's dynamism and purposefulness and its impressive successes. The Soviet people too are engaged in great achievements. The creative reinterpretation of reality, freedom from illusions and dogmas, the imparting to socialism of a new quality meeting the highest standards of humanism and progress—this is the essence of restructuring, of the renewal of all aspects of the life of society. The deformations which have accumulated over the decades are being eliminated in an atmosphere of glasnost, pluralism of opinions, and open discussion. Man is the supreme measure of all things. Everything we do—be it the sphere of economics, politics, or culture or programs in the sphere of health care, education, or housing construction—is placed at man's service. A socialist rule-of-law state is taking shape.

I would be sinning against the truth if I were to claim that everything is going smoothly, as planned. As in any fundamental breaking of structures—and we are virtually carrying out a revolutionary upheaval—ideas and suggestions are generated, and the tremendous political energy of the masses is released. For all the diversity of opinions which dialectically flow into one another and help the optimum solutions to come into being, there exists a national consensus that there is no alternative to restructuring. This is evidenced by the elections of people's deputies in the USSR and also by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which was held with unprecedented vigor.

The concept of the new political thinking, which the Soviet Union has advanced as the basis of its policy in international affairs, reflects the attainment of a new understanding of the driving forces and aims of our internal development. We build relations with all states on the basis of respect for their sovereign right to choose their own forms and paths of social development, the ensuring of the security of members of the international community by political methods above all, the democratization and humanization of international relations, the inadmissibility of the use or threat of force, the achievement of a balance of interests when resolving disputed problems and settling conflicts, and the USSR's active inclusion in the world system of economic ties. Addressing the Congress of People's Deputies, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized that we have chosen this course forever. This is not a zigzag or a tactical move but a fundamental strategic line.

Each group of people has its own past, present, and future, its own political, moral, and cultural norms, and we are obliged to respect them and learn from each other the ability to defend our own identity and distinctness.

In proposing to the world community a pooling of efforts with a view to building a secure future, we believe that differences among people, however diverse they may be, must not gain the upper hand over their commonality. People's membership of the single human race must be the starting point in interstate politics, for the opposite approach leads to confrontational decisions. As the Message of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to the World's Peoples emphasizes, "whatever barriers divide us, we have the same common fate."

One of the key tasks of Soviet foreign policy is to implement the ideas of the new thinking in specific actions, primarily in the sphere of disarmament.

The disclosed potential for peace-loving forces to influence the course of world affairs has made it possible to halt the growth in international tension and create tangible preconditions for reaching important accords on

reducing entire classes of arms and strengthening international security. In order to realize them and achieve a real breakthrough in international relations, all countries—large and small—will have to make just as persistent efforts as hitherto.

In his book "Restructuring and the New Thinking for Our Country and the Whole World" M.S. Gorbachev figuratively likened the movement of the world's peoples toward the peaks of civilization under modern conditions to a linked group of mountaineers on a mountain slope. They can climb further together or plunge together into an abyss. The global questions hanging over mankind cannot be resolved in isolation. Interdependence is becoming the axiom of our time, and cooperation and support are becoming commanding imperatives.

We note with satisfaction that Brazil, whose voice is heeded in the world, supports the concept of a secure world and advocates delivering political thinking from the thrall of stereotypical ideas. All members of the world community hailed the signing of the accords on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, rightly believing that the logic of further progress toward disarmament must result in major new steps being taken. Guided by the task of promoting this process and also by the doctrine of reasonable sufficiency in the defense sphere, the Soviet Union has taken a number of specific measures on the path of lowering the level of military confrontation. You already know that we are unilaterally reducing the size of the Army by half a million men. Some 10,000 tanks and also 500 warheads of tactical systems are being withdrawn from East European countries. Over the next 2 years we could remove all nuclear munitions from our allies' territory on the condition that the United States takes an analogous step in return.

The USSR has declared its stocks of chemical weapons and begun destroying its arsenals of them, and it is ceasing production of enriched uranium for military purposes. Our military presence in Mongolia is being reduced. With a view to attaining symmetrical arms ceilings for the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries we propose reaching agreement on a radical reduction in the two blocs' arms. We are fully resolved to supplement the zero decision on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles with similar accords on tactical nuclear weapons.

On questions of disarmament we seek real goals, considering this to be the main area of movement toward peace meeting the aspirations of all the world's peoples. Security is an indivisible category. It cannot be built at the expense of others. Therefore the arms race can only be reliably blocked by activating multilateral diplomacy and involving all states without exception in elaborating measures aimed at disarmament.

The well known Brazilian writer Machado de Assis said that "an ounce of peace is worth more than a pound of victory." In the age of nuclear missile weapons the price of peace is equivalent to the entire life of mankind. With regard to regional conflicts these words sound like a fair statement that military methods of settlement extend the peoples' sufferings.

We see the prevention of interference, whatever political or ideological interests are used to justify this, as the basis for resolving crisis situations. The Soviet Union displayed this approach in respect of Afghanistan, by fulfilling and strictly abiding by the pledges adopted under the Geneva agreements. We favor an independent, nonaligned, democratic Afghanistan.

The tendency toward resolving regional conflicts is confirmed by the gradual normalization of the situation in Southwest Africa, where Brazil, within the UN framework, is making what contribution it can to the fulfillment of the Security Council resolutions on granting independence to Namibia. The Near East knot is waiting to be untied.

Right from the start the Soviet Union has come out actively in support of the peacemaking efforts of Contadora and its support group. We have not only welcomed the Guatemalan agreements and the series of subsequent accords among the presidents of Central American states, including those reached in El Salvador at the beginning of this year, but have also taken and will take specific steps in favor of realizing the said agreements. In this context the Soviet Union maintains constant contacts with all interested states and is ready to continue making its contribution to the cause of a settlement by opposing arms deliveries to Central America from anywhere whatever and supporting efforts aimed at turning the region into a zone of stable peace.

The new political thinking finds expression in the constructive, mutually useful dialogue which we conduct with the countries of the Latin American Continent.

We are witnessing the disappearance of the enemy image and the shaping of new political and philosophical postulates free from the preservative of anticommunism and the stereotypes that have eaten into political awareness. Our bilateral relations with states of the continent are not directed against the interests of third countries and we do not encroach on the region's historically evolved ties with the United States, West Europe, and Japan. The expansion of our contacts with Brazil, Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, and other countries in recent years brings mutual pluses. We value highly the fact that in the "Acapulco declaration" and the "Uruguayan statement" the members of the "Rio de Janeiro group" advocated the democratization and demilitarization of international relations and the ensuring of development, trust, and partnership.

The Soviet-Brazilian "Declaration on the Principles of Collaboration in the Name of Peace and International Cooperation" is a major political document which develops the political and philosophical basis of our countries'

cooperation in the struggle to ensure mankind's lofty ideals. To use the just expression of Foreign Minister R. Sodre, it has been called a charter of relations among states with different sociopolitical systems. It enshrines the principles sanctified in Brazil's new constitution, namely: self-determination of nations, noninterference, defense of peace, cooperation, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. In advocating the development of full-blooded ties with the states of Latin America, we seek no military-strategic or political advantages for ourselves. We believe that this continent, like other parts of the globe, must not be an arena of East-West confrontation, and we are ready to help turn it into a region of stable peace.

The Soviet Union advocates strengthening Latin America's nuclear-free status on the basis of the Tlatelolco Treaty and supports the creation of a zone of peace and cooperation in the South Atlantic and analogous zones on the continent. We understand the aspirations of the peoples of the countries in the hemisphere, in which their innermost interests are expressed. This applies primarily to questions of economic development, raising living standards, and ensuring access to the material and spiritual benefits of civilization. We are ready actively to promote the internationalization of efforts in the matter of treating such a disease of the century as foreign debts, and we share the view that the social health of many countries is connected with its resolution.

The new quality of the USSR's relations with Latin America, with trust becoming an inalienable feature of them, is fully characteristic of our cooperation with Brazil too. We believe that it has reached the level of maturity and is characterized by the political will to expand mutually advantageous ties and to step up the dialogue on international problems of mutual interest. Expressing satisfaction with this, I would like to emphasize that the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that our bilateral relations have all the preconditions to assume a larger scale, become more dynamic, and be equal to the two countries' potential. In this respect we attach great significance to realizing the accords reached during President Sarney's visit to the Soviet Union in October 1988. I would like to declare in all responsibility that the USSR Supreme Soviet will do everything possible for the Soviet side's fulfillment of those accords.

Mankind seeks to make its life secure and free from privations, injustice, and lawlessness. The role of parliaments in this building of a new world is increasing immeasurably.

The Soviet Union and Brazil have a great mass of coincident views, which are expressed in concentrated form in a huge number of international pacts, conventions, and regulations to which we are parties. At the same time the deep shoots of an integrational nature which, in our opinion, must help build a lasting, stable peace according with the laws of international harmony are, in our view, being clearly revealed in cooperation between our countries' parliaments and in their rapid response to events in the world.

In this connection I would like to name as fine examples of such solidarity the Brazilian National Congress statement in support of the program advanced by M.S. Gorbachev in January 1986 for eliminating nuclear and other kinds of mass destruction weapons before the end of this century, the Brazilian parliamentarians' appeal for the speediest ratification of the accords on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, and also the appeal published in August 1988 to the parties to the Geneva agreement on Afghanistan on the strict fulfillment of its provisions by the sides which signed it. We regard this form of actions as topical and as according with the tasks of attaining the noble aim of ensuring international security. Proceeding from lofty moral motives, the loftiest of which is to ensure the right to existence in its global aspect, Brazilian parliamentarians are thereby fulfilling the mission of serving their own people.

The creation of a permanent Soviet-Brazilian interparliamentary group makes it possible, in our view, to exchange opinions on urgent present-day problems in an atmosphere of cocreativity. As for bilateral relations, we hope to reach understanding on the elaboration of an informal program of cooperation in such common problems for our countries as, let us say, scientific and technical progress and its influence on society's development, the struggle against drought, the preservation of forests, flood prevention, and the prevention of serious diseases. Even though it will not have the status of a treaty document. The chief thing is that it should make it possible to ensure a parliamentary dimension in the matter of resolving these problems, supplement the existing contacts, and serve to deepen mutual understanding.

I am pleased to report that, guided by the desire to further strengthen the traditional ties with Brazil's National Congress, the USSR Supreme Soviet conveys an invitation to a Congress delegation to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union at a time convenient to you.

Esteemed Colleagues!

Soviet people have feelings of deep respect for Brazil. The talent and inventiveness of the Brazilian people are well known to us. People in our country honor Brazil's weighty contribution to the treasure house of world civilization. The works of many remarkable Brazilian writers have been published in millions of copies in the USSR, particularly those of Machado de Assis, Castro Alves, Lima Bareto, Jose de Alencar, Jorge Amado, Enrico Berissimo, and others. This year our readers will familiarize themselves with the works of M. Pontes, M. Ramos, O. Frans, and O. Otero. We await the opening in

Moscow of an exhibition of C. Portinari's canvases. Soviet art lovers know O. Galdi, C. Oclia, the Ianelli brothers, and other gifted Brazilian artists.

The works of H. Villa-Lobos are included not only in the repertoire of outstanding Soviet performers but also in the teaching programs of music schools.

In a few days' time you will celebrate the centenary of the republic's proclamation. In this connection permit me to convey, on behalf of the Soviet people, to you and, through you, to the entire Brazilian people cordial congratulations and wishes for success in resolving tasks of your country's economic and social development.

V.I. Vorotnikov answered questions from Brazilian parliamentarians.

In the afternoon the delegation was honored at a session of the Chamber of Deputies. Afterward, in the official ceremonies hall of the Federal Senate, V.I. Vorotnikov and the presidents of both chambers of the National Congress signed the Soviet-Brazilian joint announcement on the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit. It will be published in the press.

The Soviet delegation held a news conference at the USSR Embassy. In the evening the delegation head gave a reception in honor of the leaders of the National Congress.

Vorotnikov Meets Businessmen

LD1606094289 Moscow TASS in English 0928 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Sao Paulo June 16 TASS—Ways of further developing Soviet-Brazilian cooperation were discussed at a meeting between a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the leadership of the Businessmen's Association of Sao Paulo (FIESP).

Vitaliy Vorotnikov, who heads the Soviet delegation, briefed the Brazilian businessmen on the conceptual approach of the Soviet Union to issues of extending foreign economic relations as well as scientific and technological interaction with foreign countries.

"We are for radically changing the current nature of bilateral economic relations, for making them more dynamic balanced and diversified, for bringing them in line with the two countries' real economic potentials," the president of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politbureau said.

"It is high time we adopt such new forms as joint venture projects, interbank cooperation and access to the markets of third countries, areas in which we are making only first steps." There are real areas where the two states could complement each other economically and boost economic relationships. In particular, the USSR could render Brazil assistance in ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, power engineering, irrigation and railway transport.

For its part, Brazil boasts expertise and achievements as regards the production, processing and storage of farm products, areas which are of interest to the USSR. The Brazilian side could take part in modernising Soviet enterprises of the light and food industry. Brazilian firms could help explore in the Soviet Union those raw materials which are in shortage, like coking coal. The creation of a Soviet-Brazilian coordination committee, based of sectoral and multi-sectoral associations, could help further perfect mutual economic ties.

"In this context we are looking forward to talks in Moscow with the heads of Brazil's largest state companies," Vorotnikov continued.

The current reform of the mechanism of USSR foreign economic ties as well as perfection of the legal framework of interaction with foreign partners, the head of the Soviet delegation said, paves the way for boosting trade with Brazil.

He pointed out that integration of the USSR into the system of global economic relations is the Soviet Union's principal policy which stems from the perestroika restructuring programme. The Soviet side has the political will to make relations with Brazil harmonious, mutually advantageous and stable, the head of the Soviet delegation said.

FIESP President Mario Amoto supported the notion of raising bilateral relationships to a qualitatively new level. He stressed that the Brazilian businessmen were ready to take part in this process which will help strengthen the two countries' economies.

He expressed conviction that the expansion of economic cooperation between the USSR and Brazil, Latin American and socialist countries promotes progress and the well-being of nations.

In the evening representatives of Brazil's largest firms and companies gave a reception for the Soviet delegation, which continued the businesslike, interested exchange of views. Earlier on the same day the Soviet delegation visited Brazil's largest aircraft building firm Embraer in Sao Jose de Campos, near Sao Paulo. The Soviet guests familiarized themselves with the shops of the plant and organisation of production. After the visit Vitaliy Vorotnikov replied to questions by local journalists.

Another part of the delegation made a trip to Campinas Department where it visited research institutes dealing with the problems of agricultural development.

Delegation Arrives in Rio De Janeiro

LD1706081889 Moscow TASS in English 0753 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] Rio De Janeiro June 17 TASS—The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, a Politburo member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation Presidium, on Friday Arrived in Rio De Janeiro.

Soviet parliamentarians met with J. Rodrigues, chairman of the Rio De Janeiro legislature, and Moreira Franco, governor of the state. During the talks with members of the Rio De Janeiro business community Soviet MPS noted the readiness of Soviet organisations to develop commercial links with a wide range of Brasilian state and private companies.

During the talk with the governor the sides described the formation of contacts between Soviet republics and Brasilian states, cities and municipalities as a new step in boosting ties between the two countries. In this context it was noted that Moreira Franco's coming visit to the city of Kiev will lay down pre-conditions for long-term cooperation between Rio De Janiero state and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The Soviet delegation laid a wreath at the monument to second world war victims.

In the evening, Nelson Carneira, president of the National Congress and the Federal Senate of Brazil, gave a reception in honour of the Soviet guests.

Delegation Departs From Brazil

LD1806170589 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 18 Jun 89

[Text] Rio de Janeiro June 18 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Politbureau of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, left for home on Sunday. The delegation paid an official visit to Brazil at the invitation of the national congress of that country.

Vorotnikov made a statement before the departure in which he expressed gratitude for the welcome accorded to them and pointed to the striving of the two countries for a further development and upgrading of bilateral relations based on the principles of equality, mutual respect and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Political & Social

Casualties Reported in Kazakhstan Riots 16-17 Jun

'Rowdies' Rampage in Novyy Uzen

LD1906192489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Novyy Uzen—A group of young rowdies went on the rampage in this western Kazakhstan town in the Guryev region on the night of June 16/17. The disturbances were soon curbed thanks to measures adopted by local authorities.

Later the situation has worsened, as groups of hoodlums, armed with sticks, iron rods and stones, have formed themselves into groups and are staging pogroms in houses, shops and administrative buildings, attacking passers-by in housing developments and on city streets.

Attempts were made to seize the town's militia station, water supply systems, and other vital facilities in Novyy Uzen.

Passenger transportation has been paralyzed, and some industrial enterprises, shopping and service amenities suspended operation.

Firearms and gasoline bombs were used in some instances. There are casualties.

Medical assistance is being provided to those wounded in the disturbances.

Measures are being taken to curb gang activity. Sagdiyev, chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium; Dzhanibekov, secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee; Zheltikov, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers; other leaders of party and local soviet bodies in the republic and of Guryev oblast; USSR people's deputies; representatives of the creative intelligentsia; and party and labor veterans have arrived in Novyy Uzen. In housing areas and at enterprises and educational establishments, they are embarking on a dialogue with the population and are calling for mutual restraint and reason. Subdetachments of the militia and of internal troops have been dispatched to Novyy Uzen. The work which has been started is being coordinated by an operation headquarters formed here.

3 Reported Dead, 53 Injured

LD2006111189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1025 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)—According to preliminary information, during the mass unrest of 16-19 June in the town of Novyy Uzen in Kazakhstan, 3 people died and 53 were injured. This was reported today at a news conference at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs for Soviet and foreign journalists.

As has already been reported, on 16 June a fight took place on one of the town's dance floors, in which a citizen of Caucasian nationality suffered. In time the hooligans managed to provoke a fight; this time a larger number of citizens of Caucasian nationality and Kazakhs took part in it. After the intervention of the militia, the unrest was temporarily halted. But on the same day a crowd of about 1,000 people attempted to attack the oblast administration of internal affairs, and only shots in the air stopped the hooligans.

The situation became aggravated on 18 June. Troop units were put into action to stop the mass disorders and to protect the lives and property of citizens. Sticks and stones were hurled at the soldiers, who managed to disperse the crowd after special means were employed and shots fired into the air. At their own request, 700 citizens of Caucasian nationality were transported out of the town and accommodated at a bus station 14 kilometers from Novyy Uzen. The roads to the bus station are being guarded by troops and militia.

Yesterday a crowd of 7,000 gathered in the town, and fighting once again broke out. The troops and the militia managed to disperse the crowd. Fifty-seven people were arrested on suspicion of organizing and taking part in mass disturbances. A curfew was introduced in the city by a decision of the republics's government.

'Hooligan Outbursts' Reported

LD1906222289 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 18 Jun 89

[Text] A hooligan outburst has been stopped. On the night of 16-17 June, in the town of Novyy Uzen, Guryev Oblast, a group of young people, under the influence of alcohol, engaged in hooligan outbursts. A number of illegal acts took place, as a result of which material damage was inflicted on individual trading enterprises and persons. There are no casualties [zhertvy], but several people have been injured. Public order has been restored in the town by the actions taken by local party, soviet and law-enforcement organs. The causes of the outbreak of the incident are being investigated.

Continued Coverage of Crisis Events in Fergana

Indications of Impending Crisis

18300687 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by "our correspondent," datelined 12 June: "What Is Behind the Fergana Events?"]

[Text] "Even we, forensic experts, were overwhelmed by the savagery and sadism of the murderers," Z.A. Giyasov, chief forensic expert of the republic, told us.

Rural young people, who, as a rule, are unemployed, or paid purely symbolic wages for their labor, account for a majority of the bandits and thugs. There are many

teenagers among them. How have the ringleaders, thus far invisible, drawn thousands of people into these outrageous acts? For this purpose, "emissaries" come to peaceful villages with appeals to the young people to arm themselves, because they are going to be attacked any minute by the Meskhetian Turks in order to avenge their dead. When the young people are worked up to the critical stage, another "emissary" runs in with the message that the mythical "enemy" has turned into an adjacent rayon, and is raping women and killing children and old people there. The enraged crowd commandeers what vehicles they can find, and follows the "emissaries" in a rush to wherever, and does whatever the latter-day chiefs tell it to.

In recent days, the tactics of criminal ringleaders have changed. The crowds obedient to them resemble organized detachments; economic installations, militia posts, and stations have become the objectives for their raids. The actions of these detachments in all kinds of places in the valley follow the same scenario—a controlled crowd lays siege to an installation, and demands that its conditions be met, threatening to destroy the installation. This, for example, was the case at the station of Kokand, where armed bandits seized a train loaded with fuel and promised to blow it up if the thugs previously apprehended in the city were not set free. A crowd laid siege to the Kokand City Department of Militia at the same time, and with the same demands. In order to avoid an explosion at the station and bloodshed, 68 of those apprehended had to be set free. Having perceived their strength, the raiders laid siege on the same day to the Uzbekistanskiy Rayon Department of Militia, and only a helicopter landing party of internal troops, which made it there in the nick of time, dispersed the attackers.

We should mention specifically the operation of internal troops. The soldiers, sergeants, and officers are literally knocked off their feet by the lack of sleep and fatigue in an effort to defend the life and property of the toilers of Fergana Valley, and it is not their fault that they have not been able to rescue quite a few people. The bandits started the pogroms with axes, homemade lances, and gasoline bombs; they soon began to use firearms, including automatic ones. On 8 July, a military helicopter flying over Kokand drew fire from automatic weapons. What about the militia and the troops? They have their orders to use firearms and riot control means (spetssredstva) only in special cases.

The citizens of Fergana who talked to me expressed their bewilderment at the inadequacy of response measures. The rural population, scared the most by the monstrosity of what is happening, is still more perplexed.

Responding to our questions, Chief of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops Colonel General Yu. Shatalin noted the certain presence of a coordinating center, a powerful and well-secreted criminal organization in the territory of the oblast. Certainly, its main objective is not to make short shrift of the Meskhetian Turks—that much is clear by now—but rather to generally destabilize the situation and organize massive robberies. As Chief of the Fergana Oblast UKGB [Directorate of the State Security Committee] N. Leskov communicated to us, the arrival in the oblast of some particularly dangerous criminals from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] was noted before the outbreak of mass rioting. Deputy Chief of the Political Directorate of the USSR MVD Internal Troops, Colonel Ye. Nechayev, stressed: "I witnessed the Sumgait events, but they did not even come close to the Fergana nightmare. The differences are: first, incredible, deviant cruelty, of which only the criminal underworld is capable; second, a high degree of organization and mobility of bandit formations; and third, the most profound secrecy—not one of the gang ringleaders has been apprehended yet."

We may confirm that the Meskhetian Turks are brought up by the terrorists primarily in order to provoke another outbreak of violence. Other calls are now heard in Fergana and Kokand more often—to make short shrift of militia employees, members of their families, and to destroy their homes. These are not idle appeals—in Kokand, eight homes of militiamen, all of them Uzbeks, were burned. Dozens of Uzbek men were badly beaten for refusing to join the ruffians. However, the resistance of the Uzbek people to violence is strengthening. In many rayon centers, villages, and neighborhoods, and at many enterprises, self-defense detachments are being organized—in total, as of 12 July, more than 9,000 people of different nationalities, mainly of the native nationality, got together in 811 detachments....

Editorial Comment

The fire of fratricidal pogroms in the villages and cities of the Fergana Valley broke out 2 weeks ago. Messages about them have come to increasingly resemble battlefield reports—a military helicopter is fired on, a train with fuel is seized, an armored personnel carrier is attacked, a rayon party committee (a city committee, militia station) is under siege, and everywhere the bandits have been using ever increasing numbers of modern communication equipment and automatic weapons. What is it—riots? Or is this a war now declared on the Soviet power by marauders, nationalists, and the mysterious "ringleaders of bandit formations," who have rallied them into a real force?

A natural question arises: How did the organizations responsible for it manage to overlook the accumulation of a terrifying amount of arms and consolidation of criminal forces in the Fergana Valley? This also needs to be examined.

More than a year ago, in its then pioneering publications on the issue of organized crime, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA drew the attention of the public to the particular danger of an explosion in the situation which had

emerged in Central Asia. The extreme neglect of the social sphere in this region, the impoverishment of rural populace combined with increasing unemployment among young people, abuses, theft, and bribery among a certain segment of the leading echelon—all of this has brought about very dangerous distortions in the perception of the law, and the development of quite dangerous tensions. We said that the billions skimmed off cotton machinations did not find their way to common people; they did not even stay for a long time in the middle echelon of the leadership. However, they could be transferred to the control of the criminal world in a variety of ways. Could it be that it has indeed happened? We also said that intelligent, energetic, cruel authorities and "sworn thieves" ("vory v zakone"), having secured the millions at their disposal, would not stop at this, but would rock and break down the mechanisms of state authority in every way possible, and weaken the application of laws in "their" territory in order to thus reinforce their own, criminal power. Could this be happening now in the Fergana Valley? We discussed the armament and equipment of these very gangs. Finally, we discussed the fact that a failure to take urgent measures would inexorably push thousands upon thousands of young people into the criminal underworld.

Is this not what we got in the burning Fergana?

We are far from assuming the position of oracles, to whom no heed was paid at one time. We are only recalling this so that now, when extraordinarily weighty decisions have to be made, in an extraordinary situation, nobody would make this task easier by [referring to] "chance" and "sudden" events. We cannot put them down to vodka or hashish. We cannot reduce everything to an interethnic conflict, and hope that the evacuation of Meskhetian Turks from Uzbekistan will bring everything to a halt all by itself. We should understand clearly who and what stands behind the crazed youths, who, we are convinced, are being drafted, in cold blood and in a calculated manner, for still more murders, excesses, robberies, and arson, with the main objective being to cut off the way back for them, to make yesterday's unemployed the mercenaries of a criminal army unparalleled in our history.

Uzbek Writer on Meskhetian Crisis

PM1906073689 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 15 Jun 89 p 13

[Interview with Timur Pulatov, "Uzbek writer" and "leading expert on the history and culture of the Meskhetian people," by Ezio Mauro in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—"Gorbachev says that the old gods are clashing in Fergana in a religious war. I reply that it is even worse. This is a blind and deaf battle without any religion or piety. The truth is that God has abandoned Uzbekistan," says Timur Pulatov, a 50-year old Uzbek writer and one of the leading experts on the history and culture of the small Meskhetian people, who were deported from Georgia to Uzbekistan on Stalin's orders in 1944, were never rehabilitated, and are now massacred and stoned by violent rebel gangs. "It was a mass lynching which could have been avoided," Pulatov said, "because the massacre was planned with care, threatened, and announced throughout the region. The Uzbek authorities now have only one course: They must admit that they have made a mistake and quickly resign."

[Mauro] Timur Iskhakovich, in Fergana, at one point, the ethnic clash turned into a battle against the state, with an armed crowd shooting at the party secretary. Why?

[Pulatov] Because the ethnic problem was only a pretext. In Uzbekistan today, the same people are fighting each other and killing each other. It is Turks against Turks, because they have the same origins, the people from the two groups have the same names, and they celebrate the same festivals. Somebody invented the national and ethnic issue to jump on the Uzbek protest movement, and to control and lead it. And it was very easy because the Meskhetians are a perfect target.

[Mauro] In what way?

[Pulatov] They are a minority without rights, second-class citizens, social pariahs. Skill and ability have enabled some of them to gain privileged economic positions, drawing on themselves the hatred and envy of the Uzbeks. But, socially speaking, the Meskhetians count for nothing; whereas other exiled populations like the Crimean Tatars have reached the top, they have remained on the lowest rung of the ladder. Satan's will held them up to the Uzbeks' hatred and rage, even exploiting vestiges of the old Stalinist propaganda on "traitor peoples." The result was the massacre.

[Mauro] You talk about it as if it were a coldly organized battle. What evidence is there of that?

[Pulatov] The activists in the movement for the Turks' return to Georgia, like lawyer Gashev, came to me 10 days before the clashes, and they were very worried. They had discovered that groups of Uzbek youths were planning incidents against the Meskhetians; they had approached the Central Committee but nobody had listened to them. And on 1 June, we all heard the ultimatum issued by the Uzbek gangs, which gave the Meskhetians 24 hours to leave Fergana Oblast. The next day the terrible pogrom broke out.

[Mauro] The official figures change from day to day. How many people were killed?

[Pulatov] At least 100. And most of them were Meskhetians.

[Mauro] You referred to the "Uzbek rage" which somebody unleashed against the Turks. What is the origin of this rage?

[Pulatov] It is ignorance swelled by voices saying that the Turks have the best houses, the best land, and the best positions in the market, won by their bribes. But, the main reason is poverty, with 1 million unemployed people in four oblasts—Fergana Oblast, Andizhan Oblast, Bukhara Oblast, and Namangan Oblast.

[Mauro] So, you think that the socioeconomic problem is more serious than the religious question?

[Pulatov] Undoubtedly. And it is certainly more serious than the national question. The people do not think about God and the nation when they have nothing to eat. This does not mean that the crowd did not contain green flags and pro-Khomeyni slogans. But Islam's influence is not as strong as people in Moscow fear. This rage has been caused to flare up by this life of deprivation which Uzbeks and Turks have shared for so long, and which has now been turned against the Turks for the reasons mentioned.

[Mauro] Is it true that common criminals are leading the gangs?

[Pulatov] There is no doubt that leaders are organizing the crowd. They may be criminals, and they may belong to antirestructuring forces. But I do not trust the official versions; I do not believe in the 5,000 drug addicts to which they refer, or in the gangs of drunks running through the streets. I have asked for information from the pathologist, and he told me that only six bodies had traces of alcohol in the blood.

[Mauro] Why was it mainly young and very young people who were involved in the Fergana battle?

[Pulatov] Because the old people have now adapted and submitted; they are anxious to keep their jobs, hoping to pass them on to their sons. But the young people do not have any jobs now, nor any prospect of a job. Our people are incapable of living outside their own land; boys therefore do not seek their fortune elsewhere, and regard their fate as a curse. They have been sitting on the fringes of life for too long. This mixture of extreme poverty, bitterness, envy, and vain hope has now exploded in the worst way. It is an explosion of discontent which some people used and which ultimately blinded everybody. The crowd can no longer see anything—neither morality nor God. In Fergana there is only a wild and therefore terrible and frightening impetus which could have been avoided.

[Mauro] This, too, is a terrible accusation: Is it directed at the government?

[Pulatov] Yes, Uzbeks, Crimean Tatars, and Meskhetians are wondering what use the government is if it is unable to defend the people. Everything is out of control in the government now. It ought at least to be jolted into action, gather its forces, and go. After the Georgia disaster there were resignations: This marvelous tradition should be continued here in Uzbekistan.

Social Causes of Unrest Noted

LD1606111589 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The Soviet weekly NEDELYA today identified disregard for ethnic traditions and experience and stagnation in the education system among the social causes of a tragic conflict between Uzbeks and Meskhetian Turks in Central Asian Uzbekistan.

Analysing the causes of ethnic violence in the Fergana Valley there over the past fortnight, it said that social justice in relation to Meskhetian Turks was trumped upon way back 45 years ago when this ethnic group living in Georgia on the border with Turkey fell victim of Stalin's policy that steamrollered whole peoples.

The Turks were deported from Georgia after being given just two hours to gather their belongings. In point of fact, they were not only forced to abandon their land, homes and property but were also given too little time to pack even the barest necessities, NEDELYA said.

Meskhetian Turks were brought to Uzbekistan [words indistinct] there literally in open fields. Local people, however, gave them shelter in their own homes and helped them in every other possible way.

Gradually, Meskhetians settled down and even learned Uzbek although they did not have their own schools in their new place of residence.

The weekly said the root causes of the Fergana tragedy should be sought in the perennial neglect of ethnic traditions and institutions playing an important role in the life of every people.

When planning Central Asian development, for example, Moscow did not draw any distinctions between that region and other parts of the country, while local authorities closed their eyes to this circumstance.

Peoples living in each republic, however, have their own distinctive features, traditions and customs relating to work, religion, the family and spiritual culture, Nedelya noted.

It said that the tragedy in Fergana, which claimed the lives of many dozens of Meskhetian Turks and members of other ethnic groups, is deplored by the absolute majority of the Uzbeks.

Reasons for Violence Examined

PM1906155589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 89 p 1

[Own correspondent Mirzaakhmed Alimov report under the rubric "Every Day in This Spot": "'Idle' Hands. It Was Often They Who Caused the Excesses on Fergana Territory"]

[Text] There can be no justification for the countless pogroms, killings, and violence. I believe that order in Fergana Oblast will be restored very soon. The ringleaders and organizers of the unprecedented fratricidal internecine strife on traditionally hospitable Uzbek soil will certainly be exposed and punished with all the severity of our law.

But I cannot keep silent on this burning problem. I have no right to do so. Especially since, when speaking at the recent interrepublic party economic aktiv in Tashkent, N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, cited this as one of the major reasons for the tragedy that broke in Fergana Oblast.

Certainly, one must speak honestly and bluntly about one of the causes of the conflict, which antirestructuring forces have exploited for their own selfish and, as has already become clear, far-reaching political ends.

Everyone is aware that most workers in Fergana Oblast—one of the most densely populated oblasts in the country—lead a very poor life.

Although this also seems paradoxical at first glance, peasants here receive a miserly wage for their long hours of exhausting work in the unending cotton plantations—cotton which we usually glorify with the name of "white gold." But this is not what we will be discussing today. Let us try to grasp the reasons for the Fergana peasants' poor life. There are many of them, including the consequences of the age-old diktat of cotton monoculture, where fruit orchards and vineyards were cut down, and the acute shortage of housing, sociocultural facilities, schools, and kindergartens. And lastly, a chronic shortage of work.

Naturally, young people suffered most of all from the latter evil. According to the Fergana Leninist Communist Youth League Oblast Committee, there are now more than 21,000 unemployed young men and women in the oblast. This is not because they do not want to work—it is because they cannot find ways to occupy themselves....

Now, when passions are still on the boil in the Fergana Valley, already-high fruit and vegetable prices at the markets soared to exorbitant heights.

Why am I writing about this? Because I think all the time about Kholiniso-Apa Muminova's large and harmonious family from the "Leninabad" State Farm in Altyarykskiy Rayon. This working woman now has the responsibility of 15 people on her frail shoulders—a 92-year old mother-in-law, three married sons with their wives and children, and her still unmarried daughter. Kholiniso-Apa herself receives a monthly pension of R40. Her three sons, among whom are a chauffeur and a cotton plant worker, and one working daughter-in-law, give their mother their wages down to the last kopeck. Even her daughter-in-law Mayramkhon gives her her family allowance (a total of R35). The Muminova family "kitty" contains a total of R340 for the month—for 15 people. Have you calculated how many rubles that is for each person? There you are....

The Muminova family represents a typical rural family in Fergana Oblast. There are tens of thousands of families like that here. Of course, they also included families of Meskhetian Turks. Every one of them is today pinning great hopes on restructuring. We should not disappoint them....

I talked in Fergana with G.Kh. Kadyrov, chairman of the government commission that has been created there, and chairman of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers. He spoke in detail about the steps being taken by the republic's government to radically improve matters in this oblast and throughout the republic as a whole. First, there are plans to extricate the oblast from the grip of monoculture by reducing cotton sowing. There are also plans to introduce new production capacities within a short period, which will make it possible to considerably increase the number of jobs for young people.

But I would like to repeat, over and over: No economic, social, or other adversities can serve to justify the countless atrocities that have been perpetrated—however regrettable this may be —by young people. The people who are trying to present this unprecedented outbreak of cynicism and vandalism as merely a just protest and "struggle" to improve people's well-being are also profoundly mistaken. The roots of evil go far deeper. Thus, nothing must be simplified and an answer to the following question should be found rather more quickly: Who needed the interethnic strife first in Nagorno-Karabakh, then the riots in Tbilisi, and now the excesses in Fergana Oblast?

Citizens Fear Renewed Violence

PM1806173189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[Own correspondent A. Kaipbergenov dispatch: "Both Life and Tears...."]

[Text] Fergana, 16 Jun—For the first time in many days I saw a wedding procession on the streets of Fergana. The newlyweds were placing flowers at the monument to the defenders of the motherland who died during the Great Patriotic War. A little farther on I came across a

curfew patrol: One of the guys in military uniform looked very much like the happy bridegroom. "Since early June we have had no work," D. Abdurakhmanova, head of a Fergana City registry office department, told me. "The tense situation made itself felt. Yesterday three couples came to register their marriages. Today there were 18 newlyweds before 1500."

The situation in the oblast is returning to normal. Industrial enterprises are recovering their rhythm. There are more people on the streets; during daytime the patrols carry out only selective checks on passing vehicles. During the past 24 hours 12 people were detained for hooligan behavior.

The charred remains of two more victims have been discovered; according to preliminary information they perished during the days of the mass excesses. By 16 June the toll included 69 Meskhetian Turks and 18 Uzbeks.

Among the many causes of the recent flareup of violence, unemployment of a section of the population has been cited. Around 20 percent of those to whom administrative sanctions have been applied by the oblast's people's courts in connection with the mass disturbances were out of work. There were also students and school children among them.

However, the truth would be incomplete without a quote from a letter to the government and the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs V. Bakatin:

"The women of Fergana City are very alarmed by rumors that the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] intends to withdraw the troops from the territory of our oblast in the near future. The present calm in the oblast is like a lull before the storm. The hooligan elements which are led by experienced people—as everyone was able to see for themselves—are merely lying low, biding their time while the MVD troops are here. But as soon as the oblast is without protection, new excesses will flare up, more brutal than the last. Many inhabitants of our oblast of all nationalities are thinking of leaving Uzbekistan, even though many were born here and have lived here all their lives and regard Uzbekistan as their homeland." The letter is signed by 35 women from a design institute in Fergana.

'Roots' of Fergana Tragedy Traced

PM1906101089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Special correspondent V. Ardayev report: "Fergana: Tracing the Roots of the Tragedy"]

[Text] Fergana, Tashkent—Normal life appears to be resuming in Fergana. There are fewer armed soldiers and armored carriers in the streets, more peacefully hurrying pedestrians, more traffic. Nearly all the institutions and enterprises in the oblast center and the surrounding farms have begun to work at the usual pace. But the situation remains worrisome, and the summaries of operations confirm this. On the station tracks in the city of Kuvasay, because of arson, a freightcar full of children's things collected by the local population, en route to their friends and neighbors, the Meskhetian Turks, was destroyed. A fire that was just taking hold at a cotton depot was narrowly averted....

"How did something happen for which there is neither justification nor explanation from the viewpoint of common sense? In order to understand what happened it is necessary to uncover the roots, to seek the forces that stood to benefit from all this. It could not benefit the people. There is no doubt of that," N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, said at a meeting of the party and economic aktiv in Tashkent. "Who benefits?" To answer that question is to discover the true culprits responsible for what happened.

Today, most probably, no one has any doubt that the events in Fergana Oblast did not begin because of an argument over a plate of strawberries—the events were prepared over a long time, carefully, and skillfully. Rapidly changing tactics, that were adjusted to suit individual cases, efficiently organized communications and information—it may be said that these actions (the actions of a turbulent crowd that appeared to form spontaneously) were of the nature of planned acts. It is well known that the perpetrators of the pogroms included employees of the internal affairs organs who, in years gone by, sullied their uniforms with bribery, abuses, and other crimes. It is hardly necessary to point out that they, of all people, have a thorough knowledge of the militia's work methods.... Incidentally (and this is now well documented) it was not only former employees of the internal affairs organs who took part in organizing the pogroms—it was with the help of the militia, in some cases, that the the addresses of Meskhetian Turkish families were discovered, whose homes then caught fire one after another.

Beforehand, various provocative rumors and forged photographs were energetically circulated, arousing in the Uzbek population a feeling of hatred toward the Meskhetian Turks. And in the latter, fear and an answering aggression. Sh. Yuldashev, first secretary of Fergana Uzbek Communist Party Oblast Committee [obkom] (who has only held that post for a few months), has reported that a few old Bolsheviks from the city of Margilan, which was later to be at the epicenter of events, reported last year (orally and in writing) that some strangers from Andizhan had come to their city and were gathering supporters for an uprising that was being planned simultaneously in Andizhan, Namangan, and Margilan. The oblast prosecutor's office, the internal affairs administration, and the KGB administration were immediately informed of this. A few days later, it

was reported: "Appropriate measures have been adopted." It is now clear that in fact no measures were adopted, or if they were, they were far from exhaustive.

So it was not a spontaneous outbreak of hooliganism based on national hatred, surpassing all limits, as had at first appeared (and as people tried, at first, to portray the Fergana events), but a large-scale action involving not tens or even hundreds, but thousands of people.

The subsequent development of events only confirmed this: Rallies under extremist slogans, the green banners that were carried to the pogroms, acts of arson, pamphlets with religious symbols signed by the formerly unknown organization "Holy Uzbeks," attempts at physical violence against party and soviet workers—all this suggests that the aims are far-reaching. As Lieutenant General V. Pankin, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Main Criminal Investigations Administration, said in an interview for a TASS correspondent, there are reports that the young people who took part in the pogroms were given money: R50, R100 each or more. On their way to commit arson and brigandage, a large number of extremists took drugs and alcohol, and that, too, is expensive.... Before beginning their action, V. Pankin says, the pogrom organizers reconnoitered the locality, identified specific targets for their actions—the homes of Meskhetian Turks—carefully studied approach and departure routes, and enlisted a great deal of motor transport. There are reports that dump trucks delivered a steady supply of stones to the hitmen, and that ready-made Molotov cocktails were supplied... And does not the fact that as of today some 8,000 items of cold weaponry and firearms have been confiscated in the oblast indicate how serious the preparations were for combat operations?...

No, the "crowd" was by no means a faceless "gray mass." In its ranks were many leaders of enterprises, organizations, and schools. Among the most active participants there were, alas, many representatives of the intelligentsia....

There were, of course, many factors that contributed to the events. One of the main ones is this: Under the slogans of boosting national self-awareness, an attempt was made to kindle nationalism, playing on the real difficulties experienced by a republic on the brink of socioeconomic crisis. The reasons for this lie in the disproportions in the development of the raw materials and processing sectors, mass unemployment, which for some reason has hitherto been described coyly as "surplus manpower," and the extreme backwardness of the social sphere.... And all this against the background of a growing birth rate. In the last 10 years the population of Uzbekistan has increased by 7 million, and today one in four families, and one in three in the countryside, has five or more children under the age of 18. The proportion of dependents is 40 percent of the total population of the republic.

Yes, the situation in the republic remains very complex. Many Meskhetian Turks, especially from Tashkent Oblast, are leaving for neighboring republics, fearing violence. The tension vibrates like a tightly stretched string.

The main thing now is to normalize the situation. This is promoted by the work of more than 200 investigators who have come to Fergana Oblast, using sophisticated video and computer equipment for the first time on this scale. The sooner all the culprits are named, the quicker reassurance will come. But enormous work is also required on the part of all party and soviet organs. The truth is more necessary now than ever before—the truth about the events themselves and about what led to them.

It is reported from a refugee camp near Fergana that some 13,000 people have been sent to the central regions of the Russian Federation from here for resettlement. The first 48 Meskhetians have arrived at a sovkhoz in Northern Osetia, where they expect the arrival of several more groups. The total number of people resettled is in excess of 15,000. Virtually no refugees are left in the camp now.

Fergana Oblast 'Stabilizing'

PM1906155989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent A. Kaipbergenov report under the rubric "On Events in Fergana Oblast": "Patrols on the Alert"]

[Text] Fergana, 18 Jun—Today the oblast newspapers published a report on the work of the republic government commission. Questions of drawing up a targeted program to increase the employment of the able-bodied population of Andizhan, Namangan, and Fergana oblasts were examined at the last session jointly with representatives of union ministries and departments. Purely economic [ekonomicheski chistyye] production facilities will be developed in 1989-1990: sewn and knitted goods production facilities, and enterprises to process agricultural produce. Administrative buildings will be used where necessary. All this will make it possible to create an additional 200,000 new jobs in the space of 18 months.

Special attention was devoted to the construction of housing and to sociocultural and consumer projects. Measures were defined to eliminate the monoculture of cotton and to introduce the lease and the contract. To improve the ecological situation, it is proposed to reconstruct and modernize technologies in enterprises which pollute the environment and to create reliable purification installations.

Late last night the last Il-76 departed with Meskhetian Turks. Precisely 2,301 people were taken to central parts of Russia in the space of 24 hours. Thus, airmen have evacuated 16,282 Meskhetian Turks in a very short space of time.

The situation in the oblast is stabilizing noticeably. There is no longer information about new acts of arson, pogroms, or killings in the oblast commandant's regular reports. As previously, the oblast's main highways are being patrolled, and checkpoints are functioning. Over the past 24 hours 369 people were arrested for violating the curfew.

It has already been reported that a group of USSR people's deputies has come to Fergana Oblast for familiarization with the situation.

"We are meeting with the population and ascertaining more precisely the facts and causes of the tragedy," USSR people's deputy V. Ivanov said. "Many inhabitants complain of the local militia's inaction. Yesterday, for example, we witnessed a disgraceful thing. On hearing heartrending cries from the next-door apartment, a resident of the city of Kuvasay rushed in and saw her neighbors' frightened 14-year-old girl with bruises on her neck. She confusedly said that a stranger had burst into the apartment and begun beating and strangling her. This incident was at once reported to phone number 02. The duty officer listened and hung up. Persistent applications to the militia and the soviet executive committee duty officer produced nothing. The militia only came after the applicant had gotten through to V. Kashun, secretary of Ferganskiy Rayon Party Committee. City people have also said that they have repeatedly reported sellers of liquor even during the curfew to the internal affairs organs, but measures are not taken."

A. Tatsitov, representative of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Press Center, has reported that it was learned yesterday that strangers have been calling on houses and apartments in a number of cities in the oblast, passing themselves off as employees of the state insurance administration, the city gas and water and sewerage administrations, and so forth. They ask about the composition of the family and nationality and spread all kinds of rumors. Measures have been taken to arrest these persons.

Situation 'Returning to Normal'

LD1806094689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 18 Jun 89

[Text] Our correspondent reports from Uzbekistan that things are returning to normal in Fergana Oblast. Last night, for the first time in 2 weeks, there were no violations of law and order. Industrial enterprises, organizations and establishments are getting back to work. The situation is changing for the better in areas densely populated by Meskheti and Turks, and in other oblasts in the republic. Dozens of refugee families have returned to their houses in Tashkent Oblast, a process that is constantly increasing in scale.

Well-attended meetings are taking place in the republic's towns and villages, with the participants condemning the instigators of the tragic events.

Social Problems Fueled Unrest

LD1906203289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Our special correspondent, Yuriy Gordeyev, is now in the Fergana Oblast of Uzbekistan. He visited Kokand, which recently became the scene of bitter social conflict. Listen to his interview with Yuriy Ivanovich Goncharev, second secretary of the Kokand city party committee.

[Gordeyev] Well, after all, what was it, then? The spontaneous outburst of discontented people, or a clearly thought out, planned action?

[Goncharev] Some want to pass it off as something natural, a kind of spontaneous outburst. I would not have said...[changes thought] I consider it a single-minded, profoundly thought out action, perhaps even with a tactical thrust.

Well, take the events of 8 June. After all, they rushed at and routed the Turks; they burned down houses; they stormed public buildings and a communications center. They paralyzed the railroad, siezed a train, attacked an oil depot and attacked the municipal department of internal affairs. They burned down the State Motor Vehicle Inspection administration, that is, state institutions. Could hooligan actions really be like that? No, these are profoundly thought out operations and actions.

[Gordeyev] At the same time, literally thousands of people took part in the pogroms. Well, just how did that group manage to attract over to its side such a mass of the people? What was it gambling on?

[Goncharev] You have put the question correctly, you know. Why, then, did that small group of scoundrels and criminals who took part in the pogroms involve so many people in these tragic events? I would have said it was not by accident at all. After all, how do the people in Uzbekistan live? Look at one rural family: the whole income, wages for the whole family of 12 people, is R200. That is a best-case scenario. How is it possible to live on R200 nowadays?

[Gordeyev] After all, there are no household plots, either, are there?

[Goncharev] There are no household plots, either. There are no privately owned cattle, and if there are, there is simply nothing to feed them. Well, look at how the city dweller lives, too. Is it really any better? There are many social problems. In the town of Kokand alone there are 5,000 in acute need of housing, and even though we have drawn up a precise program, we clearly realize that we cannot give them apartments now. Look, we have more than 5,000 out of work; there are no jobs.

[Gordeyev] But what is an unemployed person, from the social point of view? Young lads returning from the Army cannot find a job for years on end. Although the city put foward an initiative for working according to a multishift regime, and has gone over to it, nevertheless we cannot guarantee work for all those who want to work.

[Gordeyev] So, after all, they represent a potential ally precisely of those forces that organized all these events. A person who is not occupied has no means of survival and is not content with life.

[Goncharev] Of course. Yes. All that is right. Look at the provision of kindergartens. There are not enough schools; half the schools in the town work in two shifts. Is it really normal for 40 children to study in one classroom with just one teacher? What sort of education can he provide? Is it really normal for our pupils and students to be in the cotton fields for 2-3 months? Then they cannot get into any central higher educational establishment. They can hardly get in here at all. All that, of course, led to...[changes thought] Not a great deal of agitation was required here. Well, these extremists played upon our shortcomings. That is why they raised that enormous mass of people so easily.

[Gordeyev] Yuriy Ivanovich, events should teach us something. We must draw conclusions. What do you think? What urgent measures are needed in the republic now to somehow rectify the situation?

[Goncharev] Well, first of all, I consider that the worker must be given work; the peasant must be given land and cattle so that he can feed himself.

'Situation in Fergana' 20 Jun

LD2006105589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1000 GMT 20 Jun 89

["The Situation in Fergana is Stabilizing"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun—TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov reports:

Law enforcement bodies have managed to stabilize the situation in the Fergana valley (Soviet Uzbekistan) where mass unrest on an ethnic basis, provoked by extremists, took place at the beginning of this month. In recent days there has not been a single murder, arson attack, or robbery. This was reported today at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Boris Mikhaylov, spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, noted that during the whole time of the events 99 people died, including 4 women. He stressed that there was not a single child among the dead. He said 1,010 people had been injured, almost half of them Meskhetian Turks; 1,055 arsons were carried out; and 753 houses, 275 vehicles, and 27 state installations suffered in the fires.

To date, Boris Mikhaylov reported, all 16,820 of the Turkish refugees have been evacuated from a temporary camp. Yesterday 34 firearms were handed in and confiscated. In all 9,000 barrels [firearms] have been confiscated and handed in voluntarily for temporary keeping over the period of unrest. All in all, 4,432 people have been arrested for violating the curfew.

There is now an investigatory group made up of 40 people working in Uzbekistan. Forty-one criminal cases have been instituted, including 14 on the basis of incidents of mass unrest.

Thirty-five thousand ciizens of Turkish nationality have voluntarily left Uzbekistan to live in other USSR republics. They are all being given work and housing.

Meskhetian Turks Demonstrate in Moscow 19 Jun

LD1906193889 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Excerpts] A group of Meskhetian Turks demonstrated outside the Supreme Soviet reception in downtown Moscow today in support of their demand to return to their homeland in Georgia. [passage omitted] The Soviet of Nationalities, one of the Supreme Soviet chambers, is to consider the possibility of bringing the Meskhetian Turks back to their forefathers' lands.

Congress Resolution on Deputy Status Published

PM1906132189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

["Resolution of Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR: On the Preparation of a USSR Draft Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR"]

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies **resolves:**

1. To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to elaborate a new USSR Draft Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR with a view to examining it at the second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the fourth quarter of 1989.

The Draft Law is to be sent to USSR People's Deputies in September 1989.

2. Pending the adoption of the new USSR Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR, USSR people's deputies enjoy all the rights and guarantees of deputies' activity, bear all the obligations envisaged by the USSR Constitution and by the present resolution as well as by those statutes of the USSR law of 20 September 1972 "On the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR" in the

version of the USSR Law of 19 April 1979 (USSR Supreme Soviet Gazette, 1979, No 17, page 277) which do not contradict the USSR Constitution and the present resolution.

3. A USSR People's Deputy is obliged at least once a year to report back on his work and the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to the voters, collectives, and social organizations which nominated him as candidate deputy or to the social organization which elected him. A USSR People's Deputy elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet is also obliged to report back on the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

4. USSR People's Deputies possess the right of legislative initiative, the right to participate in debates at sessions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, its committees, and chambers' commissions, to present proposals, remarks, and amendments on the substance of the questions under discussion, to express an opinion on the personnel composition of the organs created by the Congress and USSR Supreme Soviet and on the candidacies of officials elected, appointed, or approved by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, to submit requests, raise questions, and present information.

5. A USSR People's Deputy who is not a member of USSR Supreme Soviet may take part in sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers with the right of a consultative voice.

A USSR People's Deputy who is not a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and is elected to a committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet or a commission of a chamber takes part in committee or commission sessions with the right to vote.

A USSR People's Deputy who is not a member of a USSR Supreme Soviet committee or a standing commission of a chamber may take part in committee or commission sessions with the right of a consultative voice.

6. A USSR People's Deputy has the right to ask for and receive from state and social organs, enterprises, institutions, and organizations information necessary for his activity as a deputy.

On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and their organs a USSR People's Deputy is entitled to first-hand familiarization with documentation in state and public organs, at enterprises, institutions, and organizations.

7. Draft laws, resolutions, and other documents presented for the examination of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies are to be submitted to the USSR People's Deputy in good time and as a rule at least 2 weeks in advance.

A USSR People's Deputy is to be provided with documents adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet and information on their organs' work and also has the right to legal and other consultations necessary for the exercise of his powers.

8. The USSR People's Deputy has a preferential right to publish articles on questions of his activity as a deputy on the radio and television and in newspapers and journals published in his electoral okrug or by the social organization which elected him.

9. A USSR People's Deputy is entitled to an assistant—a secretary who is on the staff of an enterprise, institution, organization, or local soviet executive committee [ispolkom]. The secretary's work is paid for by money from the USSR State Budget according to scales determined by the USSR Law on the reimbursement of expenses incurred by USSR People's Deputies during their activity as deputies.

10. A USSR People's Deputy is given the opportunity to use official premises for participation in the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, its committees, and chambers' commissions, as well as of library stocks, communications facilities, computers and office equipment which the USSR Supreme Soviet possesses.

11. Local soviet ispolkoms, enterprises, institutions, and social organizations provide USSR People's Deputies with premises for receiving voters and discharging other deputy's duties and provide them with hotels when they are carrying out their activity as deputies away from their permanent place of residence.

12. Officials of state and social organs, enterprises, and organizations who do not meet their obligations toward USSR People's Deputies shall bear disciplinary responsibility up to and including dismissal from their post.

13. A USSR People's Deputy who is elected a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and is freed from his official or production duties for his term in the USSR Supreme Soviet is guaranteed that his former job (post) will be kept open or that that he will be offered an equivalent job (post) on completion of his permanent work in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Trade Union Deputies Present Agenda to Congress

18280140 Moscow TRUD in Russian 7 Jun 89 p 1

["Instructions of the USSR Trade Unions to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Government"—TRUD headline]

[Text] **On 6 June, the USSR people's deputies from the trade unions presented to the congress presidium its instructions to the Supreme Soviet and government of the country which are published below.**

To the presidium of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies: Instructions of the USSR trade unions to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Government.

1. To increase to 86-87 percent, beginning with 1990, a portion of the national income directed toward consumption and social-cultural construction.
To bring the level of production output of consumer items (group "B") to 30-32 percent in 1990 and up to 35 percent in the 13th 5-Year Plan, as compared with 26 percent at present.

Toward these goals, to ensure the priority development of production linked to an increase in the people's standard of living, to reprofile a portion of the group "A" industrial enterprises to the production of popular consumer products, to reduce military expenditures, to accelerate the conversion of a portion of defense production, to reject the construction of expensive facilities which divert energy and resources form the resolution of urgent social problems, and to reduce the scale of uncompleted construction to R40-50 billion in the next 2 years.

2. In assigning great significance to the resolution of foodstuffs problems, the people's deputies from the USSR trade unions support the proposals put forth in the address to the congress by the people's deputies-agriculturalists, and consider their accelerated examination necessary.

3. To accelerate the general discussion and adoption of the Law on Unified Pension Security for all workers, and to begin its phased introduction next year.
To increase, starting 1 January 1990 the minimum level of pensions to kolkhoz [collective farm] workers, workers, and employees; to the disabled of all categories and participants of the Great Patriotic War to a level of the minimum wage.
To pay in full old-age pensions to workers, the disabled and participants in the Great Patriotic War, regardless of wages.

4. Beginning with 1990, to implement measures for strengthening social assistance to low-income people, with resources from:
—the redistribution of public consumer funds for their use;
—the budgets of union republics and local organs;
—enterprises' own resources.

5. To strengthen the social protection of women. To examine during 1989-1990 the legislative acts on labor and rest of women. To resolve the issue of increasing the length of paid leave for women to care for a child until he reached 3 years of age. To increase the level of the stipend for women caring for children.

6. Beginning with the 13th Five-Year Plan, to bring into effect the USSR Law on Leave, having established a minimum length of leave no shorter than 18 work days, with an extension depending upon length in service.
To grant labor collectives, depending upon their readiness, to curtail the length of the work week to 40 hours. To completely discontinue the practice of working accumulated hours on staggered Saturdays.

7. To curb the growth in prices.
To establish equal economic conditions for the activities of cooperatives and state enterprises and organizations.
To establish a system of review of pension and stipend levels, as well as review of salaries, dependent upon changes in the consumer price index.
To develop and introduce a new, more equitable system of regulation of salaries by region.

8. To take supplemental measures to increase the scale of housing construction, including individual housing, in order that the planned goal of providing every family with its own apartment or house with amenities by the year 2000 be commonly realized within this time frame.
To eliminate, mainly during the course of the 13th Five-Year-Plan, run-down and unsafe housing, to move those living in such housing to buildings with amenities.

9. To substantially increase the country's level of medical service, under the principle of it being free and openly accessible, to increase material expenditures for these purposes.

10. To consider environmental and industrial safety provisions a priority task.
To develop a special state program of measures for long-term assistance to those who suffered the effects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear power station].

11. To revoke the currently effective normative acts of examination of workers' labor disputes by organs superior in rank, and to extend over them a general system of examination of labor disputes. To be guided in this matter by the principle that every workers must have the right to legal defense.

12. To accelerate the acceptance of the legislative act the system of examination, with the participation of the trade unions, those collective labor disputes which may lead to a work stoppage (strike).

13. To take measures favoring the strengthening of labor and production discipline, to intensify the struggle against crime, speculation, and embezzlement; ensuring law and order and citizens' safety. To direct particular attention to the struggle against organized crime.

14. To adopt in 1989 the USSR Law on the Rights of Trade Unions.

[Signed] USSR People's Deputies from the Trade Unions.

Deputies Interviewed on Congressional Proceedings

Alksnis on Credentials Panel Question

PM1906125589 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 3 Jun 89 p 2

[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA special correspondent V. Smetannikov report: "Ship Is Following Right Course"]

[Excerpt] Moscow, 2 Jun—The congress is like a large ship which left the slipways 25 May and is now making a voyage full of difficult tests. The sea is rough. But the liner is confidently following its intended course and will certainly complete its voyage not only in one piece, but also with a united, well-knit crew, which, as is well known, includes more than 2,000 people.

I have just spoken to Viktor Alksnis.

[Smetannikov] Yesterday the chairman of the Congress Credentials Commission, replying to your question, reported that at the commission session you expressed satisfaction at its conclusions....

[Alksnis] That is not quite correct. Rather, it is not precise enough. Essentially my question can be summed up as follows: I drew attention to the violation in our republic of Article 17 of the Law on Elections, whereby some national-territorial okrugs in Latvia have almost four times as many voters as others. The law requires complete equality in the number of voters. The aim of the question is to prevent a repetition of such breaches of the law in the future. I shall say right away that I did not intend to raise this problem at the congress. It is a long story. Let's not go into detail. But I did not receive an exhaustive answer to this question either from our republic, or from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, or from the Central Electoral Commission, or from the country's prosecutor's office.

I brought to Moscow not only my own purely personal opinion, but also letters on this subject from labor collectives with thousands of signatures. And I submitted an official deputy's written question to the Congress Credentials Commission via the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretariat. I was sure that its content would be mentioned in the Credentials Commission report. But I was perplexed to find that its chairman, B. Gidaspov, not only failed to mention the question, but also in general reported that the commission had virtually no complaints about the conduct of the elections. It was then that I was forced to mount the congress platform.

As it turned out a little later, my material had not reached B. Gidaspov, it "was mislaid" in the maze of the Presidium apparatus. You will agree that if a parliamentarian hands a document in to the apparatus of an organ of state power but it does not reach the addressee—it is absolutely no good, to put it mildly. I did not get an immediate reply to my question at the congress. During this time I got a letter from the USSR general prosecutor confirming that I was correct, and deputies twice asked at the sessions: Why is there no reaction to V. Alksnis' speech from the Credentials Commission?

Yes, B. Gidaspov finally answered yesterday. Don't think that I am some kind of obstinate person who must have his own way in spite of everything. I fully realize that the breach in the formation of national-territorial okrugs in Latvia (and this, as you have heard in the hall, is now officially recognized) could serve as grounds for canceling the election results in these okrugs. But this turn of events would clearly have a most undesirable effect on the congress' progress. I believe that I secured the main thing by my persistence: Such things will not recur in our republic or in the country's other regions. Especially as elections to the local soviets lie ahead. [passage omitted]

Primakov on New Position, Organization

18001197 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 June 89 p 1

[Interview with Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union, by Yu. Sorokin: "The Shortage of Personalities Is Disappearing"]

[Text] **Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov is 60. He grew up in Tbilisi and graduated from the Institute of Oriental Studies and was then a postgraduate student in the Economics Faculty at Moscow University. He worked for some years as a foreign correspondent for PRAVDA. He defended his doctoral dissertation and switched to scientific work, and recently has been working as director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations. He lives in Moscow and has a daughter and a grandchild.**

He was recently elected to the post of chairman of one of the chambers in the new Supreme Soviet, namely, the Council of the Union. He was elected unanimously, with three abstentions. Rare unanimity for our press congress...

[Sorokin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, are you not sorry to leave science to take up your new parliamentary duties?

[Primakov] Of course I am sorry about this and it would not be the truth if I said I were not. Naturally I imagine that I shall have to lose a great deal and sharply change my way of life—it will be quite new work. But I am doing this deliberately since I believe that I must work in the sector where I can most strengthen democratic norms and the system of real popular power.

[Sorokin] Before the congress and at the congress itself many questions have been raised about the status of the members of the Supreme Soviet. In order to make them fully empowered parliamentarians, as a minimum they need their "own team," their own staff of consultants

and aides to collect and analyze information and for communications with the electorate. Will they have the opportunity to maintain this kind of apparatus?

[Primakov] A member of the Supreme Soviet will undoubtedly have his own apparatus. I still cannot talk about the details of this apparatus because the matter is still being discussed. It is impossible to resolve everything all at once.

[Sorokin] It is still unclear how many members of the Supreme Soviet will be working in it on a permanent basis. The council includes a number of major leaders, including secretaries of the republic communist party central committees, and they have repeatedly expressed misgivings about whether or not they will be able to combine those duties with work in the council...

[Primakov] Naturally the main backbone of the Supreme Soviet (first and foremost the leaders of the committees and standing commissions) must devote themselves entirely to work in it. But now it seems to me that there is no need to introduce rigid limitations here. Let us acquire at least some initial experience regarding who will be working actively working and will settle down in the council and who will not be able to work full-time and, through the system of rotation, will be replaced.

[Sorokin] The suggestion has been made that through rotation it will be relatively easy to elect unsuitable deputies for the council...

[Primakov] Do you think that as chairman of the chamber I have no interest in having in the Supreme Soviet those who have the ability and want to work?

[Sorokin] Can you give us briefly your impression of the congress: What pleases you, and what, on the contrary, causes dissatisfaction?

[Primakov] A whole stratum of people has appeared at the congress that previously was impotent, kept down—intelligent people, talented and educated people who can and will work for restructuring. So the main result is the emancipation of the individual, and political activeness.

We often talk about the shortages in our stores and this is a painful and terrible problem that must be solved. Unfortunately, however, this shortage sometimes conceals the fact that our society has already changed during this time and that the shortage of bright and bold personalities is disappearing. And the congress is showing this. But the inadequacies in political standards that have emerged at the congress is a cause for distress. We must learn those standards.

Yeltsin, Vlasov Grant Postcongress Interviews

Yeltsin on Domestic, Mideast Issues

JN1806061089 Cairo AL-MUSAWWAR in Arabic 16 Jun 89 pp 24-26

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, CPSU Central Committee member, USSR people's deputy, and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions, by Dr Sami 'Amarah in the Kremlin in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] AL-MUSAWWAR: Typically, you have pinned the responsibility on Gorbachev. Don't you think his aides must also take some of the blame? And can Gorbachev singlehandedly assume the burden of implementing perestroyka?

Yeltsin: That has been the way in all ages and at all times. Should there be a breakdown in a given factory, the manager is held primarily responsible even though his aides must also be partly called to account. Gorbachev says that he is the sponsor of perestroyka, and I say that he is general secretary of the party.

AL-MUSAWWAR: You met with Gorbachev 2 weeks ago. Could you enlighten me on what transpired during the meeting?

Yeltsin: We planned the meeting during the Central Committee's meeting shortly before the congress. We talked about all the issues brought up by the deputies of the congress. We also discussed the shape of power and the social and economic ills of Soviet society. I support his perestroyka campaign. Both of us see the need for change and restructuring socialism. We do not see eye to eye on tactics, though.

AL-MUSAWWAR: Hasn't he offered you a position in the ruling hierarchy or a post in the coming Soviet parliament?

Yeltsin: The subject did not come up, and he has made no such offers. I am still pondering the framework within which I may engage in action. Let us not go into this before the congress.

AL-MUSAWWAR: In your speech to the congress, you called for an annual referendum on the post of president. Don't you think this would be a waste of time and money? Besides, it may prove rather exaggerated?

Yeltsin: The proposition of a yearly referendum may be unrealistic. But it may be held every 2 years. The referendum would serve as a mechanism to rein in the people in power and act as a watchdog over those who conentrate it in one hand. The referendum could serve as a check against the cult of personality and individual decisionmaking.

AL-MUSAWWAR: You have called for perestroyka to be extended to the party. You argue that the party in its present shape is incapable of change. How do you propose to go about this?

Yeltsin: The party could do with deep restructuring. However, effecting changes in the party is far different from the democratic changes the society has been undergoing. I have proposed that the party be called into emergency session to reelect the members of the Central Committee and the Politburo. The delegates to this congress must be directly elected by the public from among competing candidates. I would like to emphasize as I did in my speech to the congress that the party should formulate the general principles of perestroyka and set the tactics and strategy if we are to avoid past mistakes. We have failed to realize the goals set over the past 4 years. We have not made much headway. If we are making any progress at all, it is measured in millimters. Sometimes we even mark time as the enemies of perestroyka grow in power. This has led to an erosion in the influence of the party. Bureaucracy is gnawing at the party from within and what is taking place is mere decoration of the facade of the building. I have been saying that a revolution proceeding from the top may produce a backlash from below.

AL-MUSAWWAR: What do you mean exactly?

Yeltsin: I mean that the revolution "from above" definitely supports the bureaucratic system because, in the first place, it is connected to the apparatus of power which, by its nature, opposes change. These are the lessons of history. Our society has witnessed such things in the past. The absence of tangible results, which are related to the citizens' standard of living, creates fear. People have waited for 1 year, 2 years, and 4 years. They were patient, but patience has its limits.

AL-MUSAWWAR: In this regard, we wish to ask this: In your speech you referred to the deterioration in citizens' standard of living and to the presence of around 40 million people living below the poverty line. How did this happen after 72 years of revolution?

Yeltsin: Regretably, this is true. The number is not 40 million, but 48 million to be precise. These statistics were recently published by the newspaper EVENTS AND EVIDENCE [name as published].

AL-MUSAWWAR: This situation calls for change on all fronts; and you are struggling to implement perestroyka on a broad front. During the stormy Central Committee meeting, in which you resigned all your posts in October 1987, you emphasized the need to speed implementation. Is there not some contradiction here?

Yeltsin: Change on a broad front is different from the concept of speed in implementation. My protest was directed against the speed of change and against the delay in implementation. Change can be speeded up, but this must be done within the framework of a front that is not broad. Waters of a wide river flow faster in a narrow channel; this is a law of physics.

AL-MUSAWWAR: Your opponents say that you merely talk without proposing a specific program. What is your comment?

Yeltsin: Do you not see in my speeches solutions to the problems facing the society? Has my recent speech in the congress not included a specific program? True, the time allocated for the speech was not at all enough to present a detailed program. But, has the speech not dealt with the frameworks of solutions for economic, social, and financial problems?

AL-MUSAWWAR: In your opinion, what is the solution?

Yeltsin: In the first place, economic reform needs the achievement of stability for the ruble. Nowadays, our currency does not equal more than one-third of its value—around 30 kopeks. Work must be done to raise the value of the ruble. Roots of the problems are becoming deeper—inflation, price hikes, food crises. I believe that political reforms should have been made from the start. perestroyka did not have to occur on all fronts. The tactics of perestroyka are incorrect. We should take into account our human, material, and moral resources. Today, we have to postpone the execution of certain defense and space programs. The volume of investment in building factories must be reduced by 30 percent, and not by 5 to 7 percent as is the case now. Certain ministries must be dissolved, and the autocratic system of administration and centralized power and economy must be abandoned. Relations of production must be changed radically. Land must be restored to the peasants, and their freedom to choose the form appropriate to them must be guaranteed. Reform needs more political rights and more economic and financial independence.

AL-MUSAWWAR: How do you see the future of democracy in the USSR?

Yeltsin: It is still the early days for democracy in the Soviet Union. We must lay emphasis on democratic rights. We should stick to glasnost—the policy of openness. It is important that the party's control over the media organs be removed. The media organs must enjoy independence, and we should enact a press law. The people now need those who must set an example. There should be democratic elections at all levels, and these should be contested by more than one candidate to make sure that the right person is chosen in contrast to the way some positions were filled in this congress.

AL-MUSAWWAR: The question of nationalities is now a preoccupation exercizing the minds of many deputies. This issue is bound to have repercussions for the future of the Soviet Union. There is no lack of trouble spots.

The Baltic republics are simmering. Tbilisi has flared up, and tension is still running high. I know that it may take volumes to fully cover these issues. Could you, however, briefly touch on them?

Yeltsin: The nationalities question is serious and has been made more so by virtue of accummulating mistakes, mostly by the party. The party failed to sense the danger at the right moment. There were those who thought this question had been solved once and for all. No analysis has been undertaken as to what has been happening in the Soviet republics. No one has bothered to look into what has been happening within the nationalities.

Under the slogan of building a strong central power, a huge edifice was built manned by few smart people. The Soviet republics must enjoy increased independence. They must not be made to feel like subjects of Moscow, and their sense of national pride ought to be respected. I have met here with representatives from the Baltic republics. They know what they want. They are also conscious of their worth and the needs of their repbulics. I do not deny, however, that some of them want independence and secession from the USSR. The responsibility must be borne by those who have undervalued the role of the republics and their national pride. We must work to effect a change in the level of the masses' awareness to see the number of those seeking secession reduced. It is possible for us to adopt the formula proposed by Lenin in 1922, whereby our relations are based on treaties.

As for the Tbilisi incidents, I personally traveled there on my own initiative and met with hundreds of persons. I called on the wounded in hospitals. I talked with social committees that had been formed to investigate the bloody incidents—he means the deployment of tanks and the Army to break up demonstrations on 9 April 1989 when dozens were killed or wounded—which were handled according to law but in an inhuman and bloody fashion. What happened there was a crime against these people.

AL-MUSAWWAR: You have never been heard to discuss world issues. We take the opportunity to ask your opinion about our issue—the Middle East question—and the Palestinian people's right to a state of their own.

Yeltsin: It is because I have not been asked about it.

AL-MUSAWWAR: This might be due to the fact that you only met with Western journalists, and none of us—representatives of the Third World press—could meet with you.

Yeltsin: Allow me to say that the Palestine question has continued for such a long time, which makes it more difficult to resolve. You can see that on the domestic level we cannot solve the issue of Karabakh, so how about the Palestine question? Nevertheless, I would like to indicate that last year witnessed many positive changes. Briefly speaking, I can say that your cause is a just one and right will certainly triumph.

AL-MUSAWWAR: Some deputies raise the question of Soviet aid to the Third World countries, demanding an end to such aid. Yevtushenko, the well-known poet, spoke about this frankly. Some have made reference to Nicaragua, Cuba, and Ethiopia. What is your opinion?

Yeltsin: Your countries extend assistance to struggling people—and I specifically say struggling—and there is nothing strange in this. The issue might be that of some aid that was extended gratis at the time of Khrushchev and Brezhnev. However, the situation now is different; aid is given according to economic agreements and loans are given free of interest within the framework of clear economic relations. There are some countries which have really paid their debts, including interest. This is an undeniable reality.

AL-MUSAWWAR: You worked for some time in the Politburo and you had personal and family ties with some of the Politburo members. How are these ties now that you have abandoned work on this level? How is your relationship with Gorbachev and Ligachev

Yeltsin: How can you bring friends together with Ligachev in one basket? How do you put two contradicting sides together? As for Ligachev, I believed, and still do, that he ought to leave his office in the Politburo.

AL-MUSAWWAR: This leads us to wonder about your opinion on what is today called the Gedelian affair—the head of the investigation group who discovered the strings and pillars of the mafia in Uzbekistan. The trails of this affair led to the capital and accused Brezhnev's in-law, and who today, along with his aide Ivanov, accuses Ligachev, Politburo member and secretary of the Central Committee, of involvement in this mafia?

Yeltsin: I believe what they say. I believe Gedelian and Ivanov. I worked for some time as first secretary of the party committee in the capital. I was in contact with the members of the investigation committee into the mafia affair. I say, despite the poisoned campaign against Gedelian and Ivanov, that I believe them.

AL-MUSAWWAR: No doubt during your work in Moscow, you came across the mafia pillars in the capital. These might be the ones behind what happened and is happening with you. What have you done about this mafia?

Yeltsin: This subject cannot be talked about in the newspapers and magazines. I beg of you to understand my position.

AL-MUSAWWAR: What is your opinion of the privileges given to senior party and state figures or what you call the principle of social justice?

Yeltsin: My stand has remained unchanged. The term "nomenklatura" (the leaders deserving privileges) [as published] must be taken out of use. All privileges must be abolished in a society which claims that it is building socialism. The principle of social justice must be applied to all. "The Fourth Administration"—the health organization supervising the Kremlin hospitals and the medical treatment provided to senior party and state officials—must be abolished. All the hospitals and organizations affiliated to it with all of their modern apparatuses and equipment must redirect their efforts toward serving mothers and children. They must also be put, along with the excellent health clinics, under the supervision of the Ministry of Health. I started with myself: I abandoned the privileges granted to me, refused to receive medical treatment at these institutions, preferring to be treated at the health clinic located in the neighborhood in which I live, and gave up the government car.

AL-MUSAWWAR: Do you not see that you are swimming against the tide? Do you have no fear for your life, especially as you are waging a war on the mafia which is still powerful and in view of the increasing growth of crime?

Yeltsin: I know that the masses support me. I use public transportation and fear nothing. I am sure that I will never be alone when any emergency happens.

AL-MUSAWWAR: Yuriy Vlasov, the ex-heavyweight Olympic champion who is currently a writer brought up the issue of the dreadful role being played by the KGB—the State Committee for State Security—in Soviet society and asked that the activities of this organ be disclosed and made public. Are you raising this issue? Have you not asked that the KGB's budget be announced, as Gorbachev announced the budget of the Armed Forces? Besides, what is your opinion of the gigantic budget for space research?

Yeltsin: I agree with Vaslov in principle. We must take into account that the KGB is conducting large scale activities. As for its internal activities, they must be reduced or at least directed toward fighting the mafias which have become widespread within the society. As regards the KGB budget, it will be discussed by the Supreme Soviet committee, which will account for each ruble to be spent by the KGB. With regard to space research, I only asked that the implementation of some high-cost programs be postponed for a 5-7 year period. The benefits obtained by the Americans from their space activities are higher than the costs of these activities, while the opposite is true here. We spend on space activities more than the profits that we obtain from them.

AL-MUSAWWAR: There is an issue that I would like you to explain. They [not further identified] are saying that the "Memorial" (Monument) [as published] Society—a social society that has been officially established and which comprises within its ranks many pro-Zionist elements, which are toying with national sentiments and launching a relentless drive against the "Bamiyat" (Memory) [as published] Society, which is vindicating Russian nationalism—has won you over to its ranks away from the (Memory) Society, which used to enjoy your support when you were the chairman of the party's Moscow committee.

Yeltsin: Please, do not link my name to either of these societies. As for the Memorial Society, my relationship with it is confined to the fact that it asked me to join its social council when signatures were being collected in support of the campaign to build a memorial for Stalin's victims. I entered the council as a result of a voting process. The council comprises within its own ranks well-known figures such as Sakharov and Yevtushenko.

As for the "Memory" group, I have nothing to do with it. The last time I met its representatives was when they gathered before the headquarters of the capital's party committee demanding a meeting with either Gorbachev or Yeltsin. We went out to see them. The secretary of the capital's committee and the city leaders went out to see them. The tension had to be alleviated with methods that are different from those recently pursued in Tbilisi. I offered to meet them, prompted by a belief in the need to meet with the representatives of official and unofficial groups, regardless of their affiliations. We met at the conference hall of the Moscow Municipal Council and told them: You can have your group registered after its charter and provisions are reviewed. I said to them that we would discuss the issue in accordance with the provisions enshrined in the Constitution and added that the group will be registered if it is found that its charter and provisions do not contravene the Constitution. However, it seems that they have not reached a solution among themselves. They split because of the presence of some extremist elements within their ranks. However, I would like to say that there are within their ranks sensible elements who call for the preservation of historical and cultural sites and for the protection of the accomplishments of the Russian culture.

AL-MUSAWWAR: You requested during the 19th party congress (in June 1988) that your person be rehabilitated. However, the majority opposed the move and the confrontation between you and Yegor Ligachev materialized. Do you not believe that your election and current reputation is tantamount to rehabilitation?

Yeltsin: The masses have actually rehabilitated me. This rehabilitation was demonstrated in the results of the previous elections. Six million people gave me their votes; and this is an honor that rehabilitates me as a civilian figure. However, my political rehabilitation has not materialized yet. This rehabilitation would take place if my speech, which I delivered before the CPSU Central Committee in October 1987, is no longer viewed as a mistaken political step.

Vlasov Foresees 'Show of Strength' by Right

PM2006081489 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 18-19 Jun 89 p 15

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Yuriy Vlasov by Ezio Mauro in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—"They are afraid to talk about China and it is obvious why: A Chinese-style solution to the Soviet crisis has not been ruled out. The situation in the USSR is extremely serious, restructuring is finished, some people are thinking about strong-arm methods, and the alliance which I saw formed in the Congress between members of the military and reactionaries against Sakharov frightened me. They may already have their Jaruzelski and a coup may be on the agenda." Yuriy Vlasov, the people's deputy who dared to speak against the KGB at the Congress, worked with Andrey Sakharov on drafting the document condemning the Tienanmen Square massacre, which another 10 Soviet deputies signed, and which the Nobel prizewinner was to have read from the platform if the rage unleashed against him in the hall had not prevented him from speaking on the last day. The Soviet Congress therefore ended without any real condemnation of the massacre ordered by Deng, and Vlasov now says that the Congress is guilty on two counts: "We did not defend the young Chinese crushed by the government. In so doing, we failed to defend ourselves against the risk of this tragedy being repeated here in the USSR."

[Mauro] Yuriy Petrovich, you belong to the more radical wing of the "democratic" lineup in the new Soviet parliament. Why did even you progressive deputies abandon Sakharov on the Chinese tragedy and fail to support his condemnation?

[Vlasov] It was not we who abandoned him: It was Gorbachev who isolated him, calling on the Congress to prevent him from speaking. That is very clear. Gorbachev was well aware of what Sakharov was saying. When he saw him approaching the microphone, he remembered that he had spoken seven times. For the assembled deputies, who expected nothing different, it was a signal. There was pandemonium, and that document was not read.

[Mauro] What did it say?

[Vlasov] It contained a specific condemnation: In China the government has suppressed democracy. Then it contained a detail which applies to us here in the USSR: The Chinese students' calls for democratization and freedom are just and sacrosanct and not only is it not "counterrevolutionary" but perfectly legitimate for the people to support them.

[Mauro] And why does this condemnation now worry the Soviet Government?

[Vlasov] First of all, for understandable reasons of realpolitik. Gorbachev and the whole leadership want to maintain good relations with the Chinese leadership, in view of the fact that the thaw came recently, after a long period of no communication. Therefore, they are cautious in their use of words and judgments.

[Mauro] But should realpolitik not be dropped when confronting a regime which, in the name of communism, massacres students who 1 month ago were prepared to sing the praises of restructuring and glasnost?

[Vlasov] Of course. But human values, the value of individual life are not yet foremost here. You Westerners forget all too often that we are climbing up from the bottom of an abyss which swallowed up all principles. Awareness of good and evil is now returning to the fore, although it is a slow process. Here are two telegrams which my voters sent me: The first calls on the Congress to condemn the Beijing "executioners." But the second condemns as "very sick" a society in which any statement on human freedom becomes a counterrevolutionary call. And this brings us to the second reason why nobody in the USSR wants to talk about China.

[Mauro] Is it an internal reason?

[Vlasov] Yes. It stems from the concern not to be associated with condemnation of the Chinese Government because nobody knows what might happen in the USSR in the future. There is an objective aspect to this caution and this is that the Chinese reform process is very similar to ours and so is the social situation, with the people calling for progress. To put things plainly, the government does not rule out the possibility that things in Moscow may end in the same way as in Beijing.

[Mauro] But in Moscow there are no students in the squares: What can the government do?

[Vlasov] Look at what it did in Tbilisi: The Army fired into the crowd, and four deputies who were on the spot spoke of general evidence of a blow against restructuring. That was not all. If we deputies in Moscow had not opposed it, something even worse would have happened in Fergana, and we would not now have 100 dead people (which is terrible enough), but 1,000 or even 2,000, because they were thinking of sending in the military. Comparisons can therefore be drawn between the USSR and China. Above all, the people's urge for democracy is the same and the old guard in the apparatus is reacting in the same way in each case.

[Mauro] So, you fear the coup which Gorbachev ruled out?

[Vlasov] I am sure that there will be a show of strength by the right. I do not know whether it will take the form of a military coup, or a traumatic replacement of the

leadership group, or the proclamation of a kind of state of emergency. But I know that the question is on the agenda, and the signs are all very clear.

[Mauro] What are they?

[Vlasov] First, the economic situation is very serious, and above all it grows worse every day, giving weapons to the conservatives, while the recovery program put forward by Gorbachev and Ryzhkov is clearly inadequate. Furthermore, nationality questions are gathering momentum, and among us deputies there is now no doubt that the Baltic republics will leave the USSR, perhaps maintaining some federal-type links in the economic sphere, as it suits them. So far, the people are not only disappointed, they are also angry, and it is becoming difficult to control and lead them. At the last meeting with my electors in Lublinskiy Rayon, after the congress, I no longer recognized the audience, and while I was speaking the same shout came from all sides: "Down with Gorbachev," "Out with Gorbachev," "Out with the party." In this framework, the crisis may explode or may be made to explode easily anywhere, as Uzbekistan shows.

[Mauro] But, who do you actually accuse?

[Vlasov] I say that there is a rapid and uncontrollable swing to the left by the people which will spark off a backlash from the right. In China there have been executions: Here there could be a Polish-style solution with the government in military hands, or the coup could be brought about by emergency antidemocratic laws and this congress would approve them without too many problems. I repeat, the problem is now on the agenda, it is impossible to fail to see it. Or do people want to pretend that the military and reactionary demonstration sparked off in the Congress happened by chance? I was there; I heard cries of "homeland," "power," "communism," which, when put together, have a very specific meaning. Everybody applauded wildly, even Gorbachev and, of course, the Politburo; everybody stood up, only very few remained seated, and they were insulted. I think many of those people saw General Rodionov, the man who commanded the troops in Tbilisi, as the dictator they crave.

[Mauro] Do you not think that yours is a pessimistic and resigned alarmist attitude?

[Vlasov] No. I really fear that the USSR is entering a dark period of 5 or 10 years before the people revolt because guns do not provide bread and the Stalinist order cannot feed people. But today our economic, social, political, and national crisis is likely to "justify" the use of force. I hope that I am wrong. But events in China are clear, whereas what is happening in the USSR is uncertain.

CPSU Role in Postcongress Restructuring Examined

PM1506142189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Party and Restructuring: To Be Society's Political Vanguard"]

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies entered our life as a very important political event. The debate which developed there reflected everything of concern to Soviet people, the most urgent problems of social development. And the topic of the party and its role at the crucial stage of Soviet society's radical renewal could not fail to be aired in that impressive diversity of opinions and views.

It was natural that this topic was aired. Precisely the Communist Party was the initiator of and the chief driving force behind restructuring. Precisely the party is the guarantor of the revolutionary process today. In the final analysis—this was pointed out from the congress rostrum—if it had not been for the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the 27th CPSU Congress, and the 19th All-Union Party Conference, this Congress of People's Deputies would hardly have been possible either.

Yes, unlike previous times, this time the party has received not only compliments. We have witnessed a frank discussion and, in the majority of instances, fair criticism. Tardiness in implementing reforms, in dismantling obsolete structures, and in renewing the cadre corps and attempts to use old methods to resolve urgent questions, which have already repeatedly doomed us to failure, have affected the course of restructuring not in the best way. It is also true that on a number of issues the party and party organizations in many regions are lagging behind the pace of the changes taking place in society.

Well, V.I. Lenin warned long ago that a revolutionary party must take a critical attitude toward its own activity and that the position of a "conceited" party will be its undoing. The party has spoken honestly of its mistakes, assumed responsibility for them, been the pioneer of radical changes, and also speaks honestly of the problems which have arisen in the period of restructuring. And in this connection categorical objections are elicited by direct attacks on the party made in certain deputies' speeches and by attempts to separate the party from the people, to set them against each other, and to depict Communists' activities as a chain of mistakes occasioned by the unlimited power of the nomenklatura-bureaucracy apparatus.

But, first, the party is not just the party apparatus. It is 20 million Communists, the overwhelming majority of whom—and this too was shown both by the congress itself and by the precongress election campaign—enjoy the people's support and strive to do everything to be equal to the working people's demands during the difficult period of restructuring. Second, it is not the struggle

against the apparatus in general that leads to success but the struggle against red tape in its work, against the presence in it of negligent, incompetent people who live on old ideas and stereotypes, and for the clear delimitation of the functions of party and state organs.

In Soviet society the party is the integrating, uniting force of all other organs and organizations. In order to achieve really lasting successes and maintain its role as the political vanguard under the new conditions, the party must restructure itself more quickly than society. It must implement a vigorous and, at the same time, a balanced, realistic policy, not claiming to be infallible and to proclaim the absolute truth, but, on the contrary, inviting all of society and all intellectual forces to work for the good of the country.

A renewed Communist Party must operate within a renewed society. Such is the logic of development. Guided by it, the CPSU requires all its organizations to restructure their work accordingly.

It is no easy task to be the country's political vanguard. It means, above all, living for the people's interests, showing concern for them, and organizing and consolidating their forces for the struggle for restructuring. Our society is multifaceted and diverse in both the ethnic and social respects. It is a complex matter to formulate a policy acceptable to all and, rallying the people, to lead them to implement it. But the party sees precisely this as its paramount role.

The idea that we are faced today with an exceptionally important task in terms of its scale and novelty—the task of organically combining the efforts of Soviet power, which is being renewed, and the political work of the party, which is being renewed, in order to fully reveal the huge potential enshrined in the socialist social system—was proclaimed from the rostrum of the Congress of People's Deputies. But this presupposes new relations between party and soviet organs locally. It is no secret that the role of the local soviets was belittled for a long time. The decisive factor in reviving genuine people's power depends on party committees, which must stop supplanting soviet organs, abandon petty tutelage of them, use party methods to strengthen their power and prestige in every possible way, and enhance the initiative, activeness, and responsibility of Communist deputies in all matters. At present the absolute majority of party committees have not basically changed their work methods, while local soviets have virtually no rights and are not ready to take all power into their hands.

The times demand that the well-known formula—the party committee is an organ of political leadership—be filled with increasingly real substance. Of course, the party does not eschew socioeconomic problems, which are of vital significance to everyone. But the intended approach to these problems is not economic-technological but political: to formulate the line, select and train cadres, and monitor execution.

The party's prestige depends to a considerable degree on the strength of ties between party committees and people. "Let every rayon, city, and oblast committee be a real home for Communists and nonparty people," V. Vlasov, a worker at Voronezh Streetcar and Trolleybus Repair Plant, writes to PRAVDA. "Let people go there with their most intimate problem and find an attentive, interested response. Let party workers go more to collectives with frank and convincing words."

At present, according to the editors' mailbag, many committees do not have close mutual ties with people, work poorly in informal organizations, and have not learned how to discuss urgent present-day topics and convince people. The cabinet style still holds sway, and there is still a passion for paper red tape and formalism of various kinds. And there is not enough time for living work with people, you see. A considerable part of the party apparatus is in total disarray and is unable to find its bearings in the new situation.

Restructuring presupposes deepening democratization and glasnost at all levels of party work, from top to bottom. And, of course, this process cannot bypass primary party organizations, which are rightly called the party's basic links. It is on them, above all, that party influence in labor collectives depends, and it is here that Communists' political maturity and responsibility are fostered. Unfortunately, the new trends have had little impact on a number of primary organizations. People are dissatisfied with overregimented meetings which overlook the most acute issues, and understandable disappointment is caused by the fact that many critical remarks and constructive suggestions remain on paper. And it is no coincidence that cases of Communists' surrendering their party cards have become more frequent. We still have so-called "pocket" secretaries, who are too timid to raise any objection at all with an administrator. In short, a very great deal still has to be done here.

When we speak of the party's prestige, we mean, of course, the prestige of its members. Many party members are the pride of the people. Their work and conduct are irreproachable. But does everyone who bears the lofty title of Communist justify it with honor? Does everyone set a real example in work and in social activity? Why have party discipline and responsibility before the party weakened? Why are violations of moral norms and laws and abuses of official position frequent among people with party cards?

"In my opinion, there is one answer: We have lowered exactingness with regard to the party title," V. Kostrub from the village of Kamennaya, Chernovitsy Oblast, who joined the party at the front, believes. "A kind of wholesale approach has told. And our restructuring must put an end to this. There is no place in the CPSU for chance, unworthy people."

Under the new conditions the concepts of ethics and of the Communist's honor and the stability of his ideological and philosophical principles are becoming increasingly topical. Of course, it is not a question of thoughtlessly following long-obsolete formulas and canons or decrepit propaganda dogmas which have nothing in common with truly creative Marxist-Leninist teaching. Precisely the opposite: In the present upsurge of the masses' political activeness, in the cauldron of changes, in the heated confrontation of the party's opinions, concepts, and views we need more than ever before real fighters who are ready to stand up for its line and its ideals in word and deed, people who do not accept lies and deception and who live for the people's interests and aspirations. The Congress of People's Deputies showed that we have such people, and there are quite a lot of them. But it also revealed how much we all still have to do to master high political culture and to increase the spiritual and intellectual potential of the party masses.

Tremendous work lies ahead for the party, for every party organization, and for every Communist. The preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress lie ahead. And there is no more important concern now for party members than to persistently and insistently master the difficult school of Soviet people's power. Only by constantly enhancing its intellectual potential and concentrating and absorbing the entire experience, energy, and initiative of millions of Communists and only in close connection with the efforts of all Soviet people and all public—formal and informal—organizations and movements devoted to the cause of restructuring will the party be able to fulfill its historic mission of renewing socialism.

Article Criticizes Party's Ideological Work

PM1606114789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[K. Kondyrin article under the rubric "Polemical Notes": "Convictions Are the Key to Unity, Or Once Again on the Place of Ideology in Party Work"]

[Text] Gorkiy Oblast—The rejection of a candidate for the party and the refusal to issue a party card to a CPSU member.... Blatant anti-Soviet and anticommunist appeals by certain mass movement leaders.... An ill-considered, ideologically ramshackle platform adopted by a communist in the recent election campaign.... Today these are no longer isolated incidents. Practice shows that by no means all communists who choose the philosophical position turn out to be equal to their theses. Restructuring is confronting us party members with a choice.

Restructuring unconditionally demands firm ideological cohesion in party ranks, because without it we cannot conceivably claim the role of society's political vanguard. This has been shown—very convincingly—by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which repeatedly held trenchant discussions on the party's prestige.

We recall that immediately after the elections, analyzing their results, the participants in the Central Committee April Plenum tried to look for reasons for the new, unusual, and unacceptable phenomena in social life. Most often they cited shortcomings in the work of the party's ideological corps. "Just what has happened to our ideology?" I know that this question is on the lips of many ordinary communists.

I make it no secret that blatant attempts are currently being made to cast doubt on our ideological foundations. Most often these attempts are made by people unable or unwilling to distinguish the living soul of Marxism-Leninism and its dialectics from distortions and hackneyed dogmas.

It continues to be indisputable for us that genuinely creative Marxism-Leninism as a theory and as a method of cognition and transformation of reality has been, remains, and will continue to be the core of our philosophy and a reliable foundation for the party's practical activity. But how has educational and ideological work in party organizations been organized? After all, we often judge the level of all ideological work, albeit not entirely fairly, from its successes and shortcomings. And demands about the negative phenomena that have been taking place are rightly made against those who are commonly called ideologists and who are personally charged with ideological education. But are they the only people responsible?

V.I. Lenin repeatedly talked about the objective possibility of Marxism's growing spontaneously in the awareness of the proletariat. I think that there are now grounds for talking about manifestations of a rich spectrum of various petit-bourgeois ideological trends not only in the awareness but in the practical actions of people and communists. We have not been used to talking about this, least of all with regard to party members. But is this not one of the reasons why we have now been forced to recognize this fact?

What are the causes of this alarming phenomenon? A considerable proportion of them are rooted in actual reality and the deformations of socialism which cannot fail to be noticed in all spheres of society, including the sphere of public awareness. And on the every-day and theoretical levels, too. Of course, the influence of the kaleidoscope of every-day situations on the theoretical level of awareness (and this is the "basis" of ideology) is not as direct and immediate as it is on the every-day level. This influence is all the more powerful and direct when the foundations of theory are less strongly assimilated and, consequently, people's convictions are weaker.

As is well known, there are two kinds of conviction: those based on faith, which are akin to religious sentiments, and convictions based on knowledge. Our party—the party of the Bolsheviks—was created by Lenin not as a party of fellow-believers, but as a party of

like-minded people. And this, according to Lenin, should be one of the most fundamental conditions of party membership, determining the core of its spiritual unity.

When the group headed by Stalin came to the party leadership the pure spring of party unity—a living theory developing alongside life—seemed deadly dangerous to the new chief. The party's intellectual flower—its theoreticians—was physically eliminated or defamed. The All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Short Course was declared the new "symbol of faith" and the summit of the development of Marxism, which needed no further building. For many years the party of Lenin was turned into a party of **fellow-believers.** Its organizational provisions and statutes became self-sufficient. Excessive emphasis was placed on the second—centralist—component of the principle of democratic centralism. Party members' internal, **ideological** unity, which was the main condition for their discipline and the foundation of their actions during the Lenin years, was gradually replaced by a **semblance** of unity based largely on external **coercion.** Moreover, a deformation that was hard to correct took place in the mentality and consciousness of many people: The cruel laws of external coercion were falsely seen by them as internal, rationally understood convictions. Science will also have to research this phenomenon, which lies at the root of the profound tragedy of people rais_d in the atmosphere of that time.

Along with some indisputable judgments the arguments put forward by party workers L.A. Onikov and A.K. Masyagin (PRAVDA, 2 January, 13 February, and 10 March this year) included ideas about the principle of democratic centralism with which I would like to take issue. In my view, for all the immense importance of this principle for our party's organizational building, it is by no means the principle that ultimately determines the unity of its members' actions. In itself this principle contains not a grain of party-mindedness. In general such a principle, with various modifications, could be used for guidance by any party or organization, including an order of knights errant. The whole question is why a certain organization exists. And it is this "why"—in other words, the organization's ideology—that fills the form of the principle of democratic centralism with the content of its specific manifestations and everything that we call party-mindedness.

V.I. Lenin once noted that "nonideological organization is a nonsense." This is a very important remark that throws a great deal of light on the mandatory correlation between ideological and organizational work in the party.

How do things currently stand with regard to the recognition of the leading role of ideological work in the party? Unfortunately, everything is back to front in this area—it is the organizational side that is given priority. And this despite the fact that it is impossible to cite any grounds of the slightest weight in confirmation of this approach. It is simply the custom, that's all. Traditions, of course, should be respected. All the more so those traditions which have been used to educate many generations of party workers. And yet....

In the thirties and forties the then party leadership, stating that it had achieved "monolithic ideological unity" in our ranks, and "having completed" the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, pushed ideological work into the background. Admittedly, leaving it with two tasks: propagandizing achievements and punishing those who doubted them. And the throne that rightly belonged to ideology was usurped by organizational work. Organizational departments became the leading departments in party committees at all levels.

But life does not forgive those who overlook, much less those who damage the laws of dialectics. The priority given to organizational forms over ideological content could not fail to lead to formalism in party work. This took effect in the formation of party ranks, when the ideological standard of candidates was pushed into the background by their social status; and during the selection and promotion of cadres, when people's organizational abilities were assessed on the highest scale of values.

The absolutization of organizational work led to ideological and moral losses. Since it is only by feeding on the life-giving current of ideology and constantly checking every organizational step with it that genuine discipline, the genuine unity of party ranks, and the party's high ideological and moral prestige in society can be ensured.

Let us turn to Lenin: "...How does the revolutionary party of the proletariat maintain discipline? How does it check that discipline? How does it reinforce it? First, through the conscientiousness of the proletarian vanguard, its devotion to the revolution, its endurance, self-sacrifice, and heroism. Second, through its ability to communicate and come closer to the broadest working people's masses... Third, through correct decisions by the political leadership..." (vol 41, pp 6-7). We recall Lenin's widely known words about the actual sources of the communist organization of labor, which, unlike serfdom or capitalism, "...will rely more and more on the free and conscientious discipline of the working people themselves as it proceeds" (vol 39, pp 13-14). As we can see, V.I. Lenin defined the foundations of unity, organization, and discipline in by no means organizational terms.

The conclusion is obvious: It is necessary to return ideological work to its rightful place and make the leadership of this sphere the responsibility of party committee first secretaries (we note, incidentally, that ideology is the only party "product"—we produce nothing else. It is our "daily bread").

Yet, judging by the speeches of a number of participants in the Central Committee April (1989) Plenum, the first secretaries of party kray and oblast committees [obkoms] on the whole do not, strange as it may seem, feel any

personal responsibility for the resolution of ideological issues. Some of them think that someone other than them is primarily responsible for explaining "questions of the correlation between working class and bourgeois ideologies and the philosophical and political principles of the renewal of our society" to party organization communists. Others express the hope that Politburo members and "good editorial articles" in PRAVDA will give them guidance in their work on shaping young people's sense of statehood and ensuring their patriotic education...

I may be mistaken, but I believe that there are few party committees which can boast of having substantially altered their work style since reorganizing the apparatus structure. Industrial transport and agricultural departments that have been officially abolished at rayon committees [raykoms] and city committees [gorkoms] continue to exist undisturbed within organizational departments, and consequently contine to "produce" the same old output. Obkom agrarian departments and industrial departments—whose workers clearly have not realized that, according to the very idea of reorganization, they should now be engaged primarily in organizing ideological, party organization, and cadre work at party organizations in these most important national economic spheres—continue to work as usual. Clearly, the activities of obkom state and law departments cannot fail in practice to turn into basic management of local administrative organs.

Raykom and gorkom ideological department chiefs are still on obkom accounting and control party vetting lists, whereas organizational department chiefs are on the main party vetting list. I do not know of a single instance of an ideological department chief being elected to a Gorkiy Oblast raykom bureau, whereas organizational department chiefs are almost ubiquitous bureau members.

However, here one of the "sorest" issues awaits us: Is our Cinderella ready to become a princess? Most likely no, she isn't. She is not ready for many reasons, but the main reason is that currently party committee cadres are almost entirely specialists in the national economy. In the article "Who Should Be Secretary" (PRAVDA, 8 August 1988) I already expressed misgivings that this situation would complicate the process of learning political methods of party leadership. I would like to add that it is also a question of cadres' psychological readiness to demarcate the functions of party committees and economic organs. V. Legostayev's long article "The Party's Intellectual Dignity" (PRAVDA, 2 and 3 May this year) also confirms and substantially develops these provisions, simultaneously providing a certain amount of optimism for the future.

However, worried as I am that this optimism may metamorphose into useless daydreaming, I would like to put forward a few ideas on the problems of cadre provision for party committees' ideological corps.

First, we should resolutely overcome the, in my view, essentially erroneous thesis that ideology is carried out exclusively at the center. Monopolies stifle everything, and Marxism-Leninism is no happy exception in that respect. Highly qualified ideologists and social scientists are needed just as much by rural raykoms as they are by the central authorities ("How utopian!" some might say, but I would say that they need them more). The time for interpreters of ideology is long since past. However, will many candidates—much less doctors—of science be willing today to take a substantial pay cut to join party committees? Specialists involved in production earn bonuses for their qualifications, but party workers do not. Yet we need to attract specialist sociologists into practical party work. Otherwise we risk failing to combine two parallel currents—theory and life.

Second, are we not harboring starry-eyed illusions about the possibility of training cadres through higher party schools and the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy, satisfying ourselves with the current procedure both with regard to the vocational thrust of these educational establishments, and with regard to the shaping of their student body? The Academy—the party's main educational establishment—primarily trains organizational cadres. Is that not the reason why it is the Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department that "rules the roost" there? Yet the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th party conference defined the main task of the party as the people's political vanguard as being to develop a scientifically substantiated and comprehensively considered strategy for developing our society, which, entering the process of profound transformations, "needs reliable political and ideological guidelines more than ever before." I realize that the elaboration of these guidelines is not the prerogative of party organization work. But where then does the party think it is going to train its theoreticians?

We desperately need highly qualified cadres for organizing party work. But these should be cadres who have not yesterday's understanding of the essence of party work, but today's and even tomorrow's. And, in my view, only an ideologist of considerable experience can become an organizer at this level.

But is it so easy to become an ideologist? We have tripled the postgraduate intake to the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy. The overwhelming majority of these people are specialists in the national economy. Not on the basis of their skill, just on the basis of their numbers. I have no doubt that many of the postgraduates will produce successful theses in 3 years' time. I have no doubt of this because, as was reported in IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS No 4, according to the results of checks on the work of the Social Sciences Academy, success there is very much promoted by the "...liberal, uncritical approach established there for many years toward the assessment of knowledge by examination and in the defense of diplomas and dissertations. According to the results of a poll in 1988 more than 70 percent of lecturers

assessed the academy graduates' knowledge as mediocre or downright poor. Yet the results of state examinations are exactly the opposite: More than 90 percent of graduates received excellent or good marks."

It is not only and not so much the negligence of students that is to blame for this. And it is not solely the fault of the professors at this respected educational establishment. Psychologists have long pointed out the specific nature and notable dissimilarity of stereotypes and matrices in the thinking of sociologists and technical specialists, and the extreme difficulty of breaking down and reorganizing these ideas. I think that only a highly gifted person—an educational historian, for instance—would be able to become a candidate of physics or mathematics after 3 years. That is why physicists, mathematicians, and chemists do not train their own cadres in this way. So why should the party, when training its own cadres, be so negligent about the most important part of the theories by which it is guided in its practical activity?

Analyzing the essence of the political times that our society is living through, M.S. Gorbachev drew the attention of all party committees at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 April this year to the need "...to develop its theoretical, political, ideological, and organizational work more strongly" under these conditions. I am confident that due importance was given to each word of this statement.

Only by raising ideological work, which constitutes the true basis of our unity and discipline, to the proper level can the party acquire the real authority of which it has been experiencing a certain shortage in recent times.

Voters' Demands 'Complicated' Congress's Work

PM1506155189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Article by Yu. Nikolayev under the "Our Dialogue" rubric: "A Time for Well-Considered Assessments"]

[Text] It was established long ago, and furthermore not by us that the results of a significant event in a country's public life are summed up immediately after it is over... But now the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and the first session of the Supreme Soviet, which were without parallel, at least in our generation's memory, are over, but we are not rushing to draw conclusions. And it was certainly not fortuitous that M.S. Gorbachev noted in his closing speech that "Anyone who would take upon himself the mission of producing conclusive assessments now, during the congress or immediately after it, would, I think, be displaying presumptuousness." Here there is, so to speak, no need to add or subtract... Particularly when the actual congress has not yet published its full overview. Several hundred speeches prepared by deputies were handed in to the secretariat but not actually delivered from the rostrum. How many ideas and proposals as yet unknown to us are contained within them!

But each of us has, one would think, stored up enough observations and impressions of our own to give some proper consideration to this undoubtedly very major phenomenon in the history of the Soviet state and to compare approaches and standpoints. And this is now being done virtually everywhere, to judge by the editorial office's mailbag and personal meetings with people. Literally everything—the ideas put forward by keynote speakers and others, the way sittings were conducted, and nominations to different posts discussed—gives rise to debate.

You might have thought that the boon afforded by television and radio transmission of absolutely all the sittings in the Palace of Congresses could not be plainer. All of us Soviet people had the opportunity not just to observe the development of discussion but also to exert direct influence on it through our deputies, the Presidium, and other organs of the congress. It was far more democratic! But no! Not everything there was easy or clear-cut. On the morning of the third or fourth day of the forum's work I met a colleague, a journalist from Magnitogorsk, USSR People's Deputy V.N. Kucher, who was holding a pile of typical papers in his hand:

"Twelve telegrams came over night, and seven of them categorically demand that our delegation be more active at the congress: 'We want to see you at the rostrum campaigning for...'"

F.M. Kulikov, first secretary of the Penza Oblast party committee, stopped next to us. Penza's electorate, as it turns out, showed even greater impatience toward their representatives' "passivity." There was indignation: If they didn't see their oblast deputies on the screen, it meant they were not doing their job at the congress...

Is it necessary to spell out how the congress work was complicated by such expressions from impatient voters watching television. They urged their deputies to get to their feet and mount the rostrum even when they essentially had nothing to contribute to the discussion in hand.

As we know, having seen with our own eyes, debates over various procedural matters took up a very great deal of time. But here, too, diametrically opposed opinions were expressed by the deputies themselves and by voters. Some people regard the repeated returns to various procedural details as a necessary element in establishing a fundamentally new supreme state organ of power and democratizing very important decisionmaking. Others, on the contrary, see such deviations from the agenda as overt or covert attempts to sidetrack the congress, and subsequently the Supreme Soviet, from the analysis of vital problems of concern to society. We will not here exhibit a preference for one or the other side. Let us merely note this very substantial feature, which is obviously not very well known to the unitiated.

The congress officially opened on 25 May 1989, but all the deputies had actually arrived by the 22d. For 3 days the standing orders, other procedural rules, and nominations to the Supreme Soviet were carefully examined in republic, kray, and oblast delegations and well-attended conferences. And acceptable decisions approved by an absolute majority of votes were apparently drawn up by a council of delegation representatives. That is to say, there was not, it turns out, any objective necessity to fight over these procedural questions either prior to or during the actual congress. Nevertheless the standing orders did remain imperfect, didn't they? No one contested this, after all, and the document itself was described as provisional. And Academician V.N. Kudryavtsev correctly observed that the French had spent more than 100 years honing their supreme legislature's standing orders.

I incline to that and will try to clarify matters.

At the congress all of us—participants, guests, television viewers, radio listeners, and readers—discovered for ourselves quite a few new and very interesting personalities who think in a profound and nonstandard way. But I am firmly convinced that, if there had not been endless attempts to deflect the congress from its set path toward discussion of detail, there would have been far more of these gratifying discoveries and it would have been more useful to the work in hand. And, although it is not my intention to impose my standpoint on the work style or conduct of particular deputies, I am unable to restrain myself from offering a stage direction, as it were, and addressing the voters who read these lines. Let us not rush to make categorical judgments on our elected representatives, particularly those among them who did not wish to elbow their way to the rostrum or who, because of prevailing conditions, were unable to take the floor. The supreme legislative organ is only just beginning its activity, and every deputy will have an adequate opportunity to express his position and take care of our mandates.

As we have started talking about those who did not manage to speak, it would be wrong not to talk about those others who did receive that opportunity, and sometimes repeatedly. Here, as in all other cases, everyone is at liberty to make up his or her own mind as to who's who among the deputies.

I was, to put it mildly, perplexed by one freewheeling speech at the fourth sitting of the congress, with its disparaging descriptions of members of the elective Supreme Soviet and the actual work of such a representative forum. One heard here the phrases "stupefying majority voting," "aggressively subservient majority," and "Stalinist-Brezhnevite Supreme Soviet..." You will recall that journalist colleagues sitting alongside began whispering to one another: Should we now yield to the minority? How long is he going to go on pinning labels? However, cries of approbation were also heard. There's a really bold speaker! True, those who "approved" such "boldness" were soon obliged to substantially modify their assessments, particularly after they became acquainted with the Supreme Soviet's work. Can one really describe it as "Stalinist-Brezhnevite" or even equate it with such? At their sessions, both joint and separate, the chambers demonstrated both firmness and political perspicacity.

Many people, I know, observed with interest the energetic line taken by Deputy G.Kh. Popov, all of whose speeches aroused conflicting views. At the very first sitting of the congress he passionately tried to convince the assembly: "The principle of contested elections [printsip alternativnosti] must be applied to Supreme Soviet elections as well..." He urged people to follow the example of Muscovites, who nominated 55 candidates for 29 seats. And his arguments seemed logical and convincing... But when the principle of contested elections operated it aroused the furious wrath of... G.Kh. Popov himself when it turned out that the deputies elected by a majority vote to the Supreme Soviet were anything but the ones he wanted to see there. Immediately the deputy took the rostrum and began dividing the congress into representatives of the "democratic orientation" and the rest and calling for the formation of an opposition.

And by the end of the congress' work we saw a third Popov, so to speak—the economic scientist presenting his own view of the difficulties in our economy. His opinions were not indisputable but they did contain a constructive and creative beginning...

Consider the deputy's personality and stance... How one man could look so different. And now is the time for a very balanced approach to everything that was said from that elevated rostrum. It goes without saying that it would be appropriate for deputies to seriously judge their positions against their voters' opinions and instructions. It is no coincidence that we should be discussing that now. The deputies had an opportunity to acquaint themselves with roundups of the mail addressed to the congress. Voters have been presenting a great many proposals of the most varied kind. But the main, crucial instruction was the demand for "more work, greater specificity. Measure your words and actions against the people's interests, permit no deviation from the Leninist path. Show unity in this great and important work. Defend the prestige of the CPSU and the party line. Resolutely rebuff the demagogues. Restructuring must live and develop."

Those lines are taken from a letter from V. Ilichev (Mostovskiy settlement, Krasnodar Kray). In different words, perhaps, the same ideas were set out in thousands of citizens' addresses to their elected representatives.

In the mail received at the congress and our editorial office special concern is expressed at the slow improvement of the economic mechanism and raising of the people's living standards. The congress highlighted the

most painful issues in our life. Practicable proposals were expressed on how to ensure the real sovereignty of the soviets, and how to unravel the dense knot of contradictions in the economic and social spheres, interethnic relations, and in the creation of a rule-of-law state. It is important now to think about how to implement them and what forces can and must be relied on. In this sense the views and ideas of USSR people's deputies themselves, generalized by the sociological service of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Soviet state building and law, are of undoubted interest. They held a poll during which they asked the following question: "Do you pin your hopes for the improvement of the situation in the country on the activity of the following political institutions, party and state leaders, and social organizations in the country?"

The replies that they received are very remarkable. Most deputies (81 percent) pin their hopes on the activity of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Some 78 percent opt for the activity of the Congress of People's Deputies, while 72 percent prefer the activity of the party as a whole... But within these statistics there are figures which must be considered in depth and from which the appropriate conclusions must be drawn. The very low vote of confidence in the trade unions and the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League, for example, is alarming.

Generally speaking, we all have things to think about. It will be no exaggeration to say that the congress has extended the horizon and scale of restructuring. During these memorable days we have heard from its rostrum the things which worry Soviet people most of all. Fundamentally new approaches to the solution of problems which have long been acute were agonizingly and arduously produced. Now it is necessary to ensure that everything reasonable, innovatory, and constructive is reflected as quickly as possible in concrete actions. Undoubtedly it would be beneficial to produce rigorous, well weighted, and definitely committed assessments, notably with regard to those proposals and conclusions which, at first glance, seem unacceptable or insufficiently well reasoned. No single flow of thought, no single idea should pass by without receiving our heightened attention. Then the collective search for ways to achieve the revolutionary transformation of life will proceed more energetically and successfully.

Gdlyan, Ivanov Actions Prompt Paper's Rejoinder

PM2006133589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Second Edition p 8

[Own information report under the rubric "We Answer Readers": "The Commission Will Decide"]

[Text] The editors are continuing to receive letters and telegrams connected with the activity of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigative group under the leadership of T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov. Readers raise several questions: Why does the central press not give T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov an opportunity to speak; why were they taken off the investigation into the case of bribetaking in Uzbekistan even before the commission set up by the Congress of People's Deputies drew conclusions; what violations of socialist legality were committed by the investigators of the group headed by T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov; and which facts specifically served as the grounds for setting up the commission?

First of all, we would like to remind you that in IZVESTIYA of 11 June 1989, the Commission of USSR People's Deputies to Verify the Materials Connected with the Activity of the Prosecutor's Office Investigative Group put an insistent request to the mass news organs to refrain from discussing this case for the duration of the commission's work. At the same time the commission appealed to individual citizens and groups to stop sending it letters and telegrams with the aim of either discrediting or defending the investigative group.

The mass media, including PRAVDA, treated the commission's request with understanding, realizing that its members must work in a calm atmosphere ruling out any external pressure. However, USSR people's deputies T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov evidently reached a different conclusion. At rallies, forestalling the commission's conclusions and citing no facts, they are once again trying to convince people that they are right and committed no violations of socialist legality, while the very creation of both the first and the present deputies' commission to verify the materials connected with their group's activity is, in their opinion, an attempt to mess up the matter of exposing corrupt leaders in both Uzbekistan and Moscow, and to cast doubt on honest and principled work over 6 years.

We believe that such statements by T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov not only show their disrespect for the USSR people's deputies who are members of the commission, but also excite public opinion, create an unhealthy stir around the work of the deputies' commission, and hinder the establishment of the truth.

Therefore, the editors believe that they have a right to give answers to the questions which readers continue to put to them. We will emphasize here that we do not aim to influence in the slightest the results of the commission's work: It alone has the final word in establishing the truth.

So, have T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov been afforded an opportunity to speak in the central press? Yes, and more than once. First IZVESTIYA suggested that T. Gdlyan express his viewpoint on what was happening under the rubric "Legal Dialogues," which is popular with readers. Then PRAVDA suggested that T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov take part in a "roundtable" devoted to precisely this question. And we guaranteed that their every word would be conveyed to the readers, down to the last comma. Neither suggestion was accepted.

Why? We might be mistaken, but we get the impression that T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov simply have nothing to say, and that they have no authentic facts confirming the statements that they made during the election campaign and during and since the work of the Congress of People's Deputies. Recently, for example, one of them declared that they are keeping documents in various safe places. The statement is designed for naive people, to put it mildly. If such documents exist, why were they not submitted—even copies of them—to the first commission, and why did T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov not read them out at the congress, for each of them more than once had access to the high rostrum? In the end, they were given an opportunity to do this in PRAVDA's pages. T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov did not wish to take advantage of that opportunity. And again: They demanded to be given an opportunity to appear in the newspaper not in dialogue with their opponents, but only with their own opinion. But if T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov are confident that they are right and can prove this with investigative materials, why should they fear those who hold a different viewpoint? According to the logic of things, such a public argument would play precisely into the hands of the investigators, who demand broad publicity for their activity. But they rejected precisely this argument. They preferred the platform of rallies at which they can claim whatever they like without being afraid of meeting with specific objections from opponents.

Now about why T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov were dismissed from the leadership of the investigative group. A. Sboyev, acting chief of the USSR Prosecutor's Office Investigative Section, explained to the editors that over the past 6 months T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov, who were engaged in the election struggle for election as people's deputies, virtually withdrew from leadership of the group. This was also confirmed by group member O. Litvak, who added that an unhealthy atmosphere has recently taken shape in the group itself through the fault of its leaders—which has adversely affected the course of the investigation. Certain investigators, including O. Litvak himself, have been forced to apply to leave the group. Taking all this into account, as well as the groundless statements, inadmissible for an investigator, in which T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov deliberately compromised the USSR Supreme Court and individual senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, the leadership of the USSR Prosecutor's Office deemed it expedient to remove them from leadership of the investigative group in the interests of the matter. These are the facts. A. Sboyev and then USSR General Prosecutor A. Sukharev, too, rejected as unsubstantiated the statements by T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov that party organs had pressured the USSR Prosecutor's Office with a view to ending the investigation with respect to a number of responsible persons.

And, finally, what occasioned the creation of the commission of USSR people's deputies, and which materials have been supplied to it for verification?

We were told at the USSR Prosecutor's Office that it, the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, and the USSR Supreme Court are receiving complaints about substantial violations of the norms of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and Uzbek Criminal Procedure Codes by investigators of T. Gdlyan's group during the investigation. We do not think this is the time to retell their substance. First, this has already been done in the text of the conclusion of the commission created on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to verify statements and complaints (IZVESTIYA 20 May 1989) and, second, all complaints and statements must be verified most carefully, as is the custom in a rule-of-law state. It was for this that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies formed an independent special commission. And it will verify the validity of the statements which T. Gdlyan and N. Ivanov made. The results of the commission's work will be published.

We emphasize once again that we are in no way trying to put any pressure on members of the deputies' commission by means of this article. Its purpose is to answer the stream of readers' questions, to react to the stir being artificially fanned around the question under examination, and thereby to enable people's deputies to work in a calm atmosphere. And we expect the same approach from all the interested sides.

Supreme Court Chairman Comments on Law Reform

LD1506214689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1440 GMT 12 Jun 89

["Man and Law" program: commentary by Yevgeniy Alekseyevich Smolentsev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court]

[Text] Dear comrade radio listeners. The theme of my talk is concerned with the question of judicial and legal reform. At the Congress of People's Deputies there were trenchant discussions of the problem of creating in our country a truly law-governed state, at the basis of which there must be the supremacy, the leadership of the law. In such a state, a law adopted by the supreme body of power may not be revoked, altered, or suspended by any departmental documents, directives, or resolutions whatsoever. It must be executed by all—party bodies, the government, institutions and organisations, all public servants, and private citizens. Any conflict between a private citizen and the authorities or any other body must be resolved only by the court. Moreover, the defense of the person against arbitrariness, wilfulness, and license must be guaranteed. As is known, deviation from these principles in the past led to the most serious consequences.

The law must be an unshakeable barrier in the way of any decisions which counter the law, no matter by what, so to speak, strategic or lofty motives they are guided.

Then there will be no destruction of the natural environment, no squandering of wealth, nor the creation and implementation of unjustified projects, and so on.

A law-governed state is not compatible with legal nihilism, invulnerability of officials. Therefore, it is extraordinarily important to cultivate in the people legal culture, legal knowledge, a high degree of awareness of law and order, of observance of the law. And here we have a great number of shortcomings.

In a law-governed state, the principle of mutual responsibility of the state and of the individual must be fully implemented. There are no rights without duties.

It is understandable that the role of the law enforcement bodies, and first and foremost, of the court in the protection of the individual's rights and freedoms is great. It is not by accident that at the Congress of People's Deputies the problems of law and of justice were examined in such great depth, or that they are being discussed with such interest by the public and the mass media now.

People link radical improvements in the work of all law enforcement bodies which are called upon to strengthen the rule of law, to defend democratic principles, citizen's rights, and freedoms with the implementation of the planned judicial and legal reform. The structures and forms of the activity of these bodies took shape in the late twenties and early thirties and did not then guarantee the rule of law in the country. In the late fifties and early sixties, a reform of Soviet law was carried out. However, it lacked the necessary scope and scale and did not lead to a radical restructuring of the activity of all these bodies. The legal institutions were not, in fact, fully oriented toward man.

At present, the proposals for judicial and legal reform are aimed at the democratization of the law enforcement bodies, at the maximum development and strictest protection of citizens' rights. Implementation of the tasks facing us raises the need to refine and seek new and more effective forms of their activity. In this respect, I would like to support the proposal to make the entire investigative apparatus form a self-sufficient body, independent of the procuracy and of the Interior Ministry. The creation of such a body would undoubtedly have a positive effect not only on the quality of investigation itself, but to no less an extent on the quality of supervision by the procuracy of the investigation, which is just as extremely important.

It seems to me that it is impermissible, it is inexpedient to concentrate operational and investigative work in one body, such as the Interior Ministry, since the possible merging of these two trends in work is fraught with negative consequences. Militia organs released from investigations could pay more attention to operational investigation work, strengthening and developing it.

The court is far from being indifferent as to how bodies of preliminary investigation cope with their duties. The high quality of their work and the skilled preliminary investigation carried out within the framework of the strictest observation of legal proceedings is vital in helping the court to make a correct decision on a case.

Just as highly important for real justice is the question of the contentious nature and equality of the parties in legal proceedings. But can there be serious talk of the presence of equal parties in proceedings when the procurator, side by side with the function of upholding the prosecution, has also been endowed with the function of supervising the due process of law while the case is being examined in the court? This function of the procuracy is also in contradiction to the principle of the court's independence and places the procuracy above the court.

In the first years of Soviet power, in accordance with Leninist principles and set down in the letter on twofold subordination and the rule of law, supervision by the procuracy did not have any administrative power at all. The only rights and duties of the procuracy were to hand a case over to the court's judgement. Such an approach excluded the supervisory functions of the procuracy over the court, and this was consolidated in 1922 in the statute on the prosecutor's supervisory powers, and in 1926 in the statute on the RSFSR's judiciary system. It was only in 1933, at the proposal of Stalin, that the USSR Central Executive Committee and Soviet of People's Commissars, in instituting the procuracy, decreed that it should be given the function of observing that those juridical institutions of the union republic correctly and uniformly applied the laws. However, that tenet directly contradicted the Constitution of 1924 and subsequently was not brought into line with the Constitution of 1936; nor does it conform with articles 153 or 164 of the present Constitution which is in force.

If one proceeds from the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, one may hope that by realizing the ideas on radical juridical and legal reform, our court will really become the central body of a system of social control and will take its proper place. This is extremely necessary, because for a long time, preceding the 27th party congress, negative trends were accumulating in the system of the bodies of justice. The judges were constantly losing their independence. A secondary role was assigned to the court in the system of law enforcement bodies. If we really want to put it at the top of the whole legal pyramid, then we must first and foremost envisage not in words but in deeds such guarantees that would guarantee it real independence from no matter which bodies.

On more than one occasion the question has been raised to the effect that judicial activity should not be subordinate to the Ministry of Justice and its organs in the provinces. Nor can one talk of the absolute independence of courts until normal conditions of work which

conform to their position are created, and until the salaries of court personnel—which today are significantly lower than the average throughout the country—are raised.

Now, many are speaking up for the creation in our country of trial by jury. This proposal is unacceptable to me because juries or assessors, irrespective of the nuances in the court structure, are highly restricted in their rights. In a court they are mute, their rights and duties are only to observe what is taking place at the session and to answer just one question: Is the defendant guilty? In the courts of bourgeois states, they participate in only a few cases. In Britain, in 2 percent; in the United States, 4 percent; France has long since renounced trial by jury.

Our people's assessors have considerably more rights. Possessing all the rights of judge, the people's assessor participates in a trial, in the examination of evidence, and in settling petitions on an equal footing with a judge. In the retiring rooms he has an equal voice in the decision of literally all questions.

Those who criticize the institution of people's assessor in its present form usually maintain that, as they say, it has many rights, but it makes use of them far from all the time because, owing to the lack of special training, it often relies upon the authority of a professional judge. But, if the institution of juror-assessors were to be introduced, it, too, would consist mainly of people who are ill-versed in judicial matters. So then, the task consists in improving the qualitative composition of the people's assessors. A more responsible attitude must be taken toward their selection. Unfortunately, sometimes not always the wisest and worthiest people, able to understand the complex situations in life which they have to encounter in court, are released for work in court. Instead it is the people who will do the least damage to production who are elected people's assessors. They must be taught. Active participation must be elicited from them.

At the same time, I share the thought which advocates expanding the numerical strength of people's assessors to four people, in combination with one judge, or three in the combination of two permanent judges. In cases of heightened complexity, such an increase in the strength of the court may raise the level of justice.

The question of the wider participation of the defense in legal proceedings has also long since come to a head. This is not simply a question of the possibilities and rights of the lawyer. It is a question of guaranteeing the rule of law, of strengthening the legal protection of members of our society. A highly qualified and strong defense is needed not only in court but also at the earlier stage of the inquiry, and not once it has finished. In the strict framework of the law, lawyers must actively promote the implementation of justice, the establishment of truth in court. The demands on the prosecution proving its case must be raised, not lowered. That is why the positive solution of the question regarding the lawyer's admittance to participation in the case at the preliminary investigation stage from the moment of the person's arrest, or from the moment he is charged would be yet another guarantee against investigative and judicial errors.

Rules must be enshrined in law which could give a citizen, in any difficult situation, the opportunity of applying unhindered for the aid of a lawyer.

And to another problem which gives rise to heated debates: You, of course, know the great interest in the ongoing discussion of the draft law on the fundamentals of criminal legislation. Many express their agreement with their main thrust—for the expansion and strengthening of the democratic and humane principles.

However, there are also quite a few who would like to resolve the problem of the struggle against crime by making punishment more severe. What can be said on that account? In the past few years the legislation of 1982, which significantly rendered the sanctions of many articles of the criminal code more humane, has had a decisive influence on the formation of determining the punishment of the convicted person. Measures of criminal and legal action unconnected with a deprivation of liberty for a convict have begun to assume more and more importance. However, I should like to stress that the amount of deprivation of liberty is reduced, mainly for less dangerous criminals who have committed crimes for the first time and which are negligent or do not pose a great danger. In all respects this is justified, for persons of this category, under these types of punishment, are reformed more reliably than by a deprivation of liberty.

At the same time, we have never, and will not, renounce the use of strict punishment for persons who have committed serious crimes, for recidivists, or for those who persistently refuse to carry on an honest working life. For most dangerous crimes—premeditated murder, robbery with violence, burglary, rape, premeditated grievous bodily harm—prescribing a deprivation of liberty to the guilty party not only predominates but also exceeds 90 percent. Indeed, the sentences themselves for the deprivation of liberty which are prescribed to dangerous criminals have not at all been reduced in recent years. Thus, the protection of society from serious crimes and dangerous criminals on the part of the court is not slackening.

That is the general line. However, it does not exclude errors which, unfortunately, are sometimes made by the courts. Recently, in particular, this is most characteristic in deciding cases of malicious hooliganism. In the conditions of restructuring and the democratization of all aspects of our society's life, we cannot fail to take account of the fact that an excessive tendency toward making misdemeanours into bigger crimes than they are, the fixing of strict sanctions for commiting them, will

inflict not just moral but also considerable material damage on society as a whole. Even if only because a considerable section of citizens are thereby excluded from the sphere of highly productive and social labour.

Taking all this into account, I cannot agree with those who see a solution to the problem of the struggle against crime as lying in increasing the severity of punishment. Life and legal practice have convincingly demonstrated that the severity of punishment disproportionate with the deed commited may lead to—and on more than one occasion has led—to extreme negative consequences. Up until quite recently, every year under various pretexts decrees on amnesties or on the early release from places of deprivation of liberty of a considerable number of people had to be adopted, simply because these places were overcrowded.

I would like to touch upon just one circumstance here which seems to be very important. I mean a question which has given rise to very many disputes, the question of whether the death penalty should or should not be in our legislation. Taking account of the fact that the absolute majority of countries lack such a measure, many propose that it should also be exluded from our legislation. Under the existing legislation, it is envisaged in 15 elements of crime, not including military crimes committed in time of war or in a military situation. It is thought that the range of these elements is unjustifiably broad. An analysis of legal practice shows that over the past 10 to 15 years, the death penalty has been passed extremely rarely on men who have committed a nonviolent, mercenary crime, and on women who have committed any crime—literally on just a handful of convicts. It has not been applied at all for the violation of hard currency regulations, and for certain other crimes.

Taking this into account, evidently the need does not arise to leave this measure in the legislation for mercenary crimes since in this sphere, the law has turned out to be impracticable and in fact it is inoperative. At the same time, I consider it premature to abolish this extreme measure with respect to persons who have committed premeditated murder in aggravated circumstances, in particular from hooliganistic motives, with particular cruelty, by a method which endangers the lives of many people, when several persons are the victims of the murderer, or when the murder is accompanied by rape. To revoke that measure with respect to such persons would be inhuman with regard to society as a whole. The seriousness of the ensuing consequences, the danger to society presented by the person who committed premeditated murder, are sometimes such that the application of only the extreme measure—the death penalty—is justified.

Finally, in deciding this question, one should not fail to take account also of the fact that the possibility of the application of such a measure has a certain deterring and restraining influence on criminal elements and thereby furthers the general prevention of premeditated murders. Such a point of view is maintained also by the majority of citizens and they inform law enforcement bodies, the editorial boards of newspapers, and journals, television, and radio of this.

The interested and comprehensive discussions of all problems of legal reform, and its subsequent implementation are a significant stage on the path to creating a truly law-governed socialist state.

Estonian Delegate Assesses Gorbachev's Report

PM1606091789 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 2 Jun 89 p 3

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Mikhail Bronshteyn by special correspondent G. Kacheva in Moscow under the rubric "USSR People's Deputies Speak": "Mikhail Bronshteyn: 'Our Views of Problems Coincide'"; date of interview not given]

[Text] Moscow—I must admit, we expected that M.S. Gorbachev's report would be more detailed, not quite so short, that questions would not be merely raised but rather developed. As for the part that was devoted to the economy, I must say that the conclusions as to what constitutes the key to the improvement of the economy and what has caused its serious, protracted malady fully coincide with my own. In other words, it was finally admitted that all our well-meaning intentions to improve things founder on the market imbalance and the lack of information. "All our failures, omissions, and troubles have merged in the main problem of today—the imbalance in the market," it was noted in the report. "It is this problem which undoes the small but nonetheless perceptible positive shifts which have emerged in the economy and the social sphere. This question has become a polititical issue." Above all, it is necessary to normalize the situation in the market—this is the most urgent task today.

The value of the ruble is falling, and neither economic incentives nor the best social programs are having any impact. The new economic policy in its time initiated the struggle against this phenomenon because even then it was obvious that people would not work for worthless scraps of paper. At present the shortage of essential goods has become the outward sign of the ruble's devaluation. Anything that can be stored for a long time has disappeared from the market: washing powder, soap, and salt—even though it must be acknowledged that salt can deteriorate and that it is by no means harmless to keep breathing in the washing powder "scent" at home. There are plenty of these goods in the country, but the stores are empty. Only during the war years did soap and matches become currency. Yet today barter trade is flourishing—I give you this, you give me that. It is no longer a question of **earning money** but rather of **getting goods**, and that is a symptom of an ailing economy.

The report also outlined the paths to be followed—redistribution of available resources in the interests of resolving the most crucial problems. It is necessary to reduce the amount of capital investment in production construction, to finally curb departmental interests. After all, the number of "unfinished projects" continues to grow. Billions of rubles are going down the drain. It is necessary to cut military expenditure, expenditure on space programs, and expenditure on the maintenance of the administrative apparatus. We are pinning great hopes on the USSR Supreme Soviet, we are hoping that it will **not** vote in a budget with a R100 billion deficit, as the old Supreme Soviet did.

We are hoping that the committees and commissions created under the USSR Supreme Soviet will establish strict and rigorous supervision by deputies of where the money is going. It is the task of the country's supreme organ of power to analyze all state programs, to verify whether the country really needs the "big" projects, and to decide which ministries are needed. The report stated: "Enterprises, concerns, joint stock companies, and cooperatives must become the main agents in the economy. In order to resolve common tasks and coordinate efforts they will, it seems obvious, form associations and unions on a voluntary basis which will then take over the functions currently carried out by ministries."

Figuratively speaking, we will have to decide which ministries are "cats" that can be described as "good mousers" and therefore useful, and which of them are the kind of "cats" that "merely please themselves" and are worried only about their own welfare.

This task can only be carried out by an organ under USSR Supreme Soviet jurisdiction staffed by specialists with the highest qualifications. On this issue the position of the deputies from our republic coincides with the position of the Moscow group: It is necessary to set up a committee to elaborate overall economic strategy, or a **committee for economic reform**, half of whose members would be people's deputies and the other half members of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

What other points in M.S. Gorbachev's report appear important to me? The call to live within our means, the need for thrift—although, please note, it emphasizes that this must in no way affect the social program. On the contrary, a number of social policy priorities for the upcoming period were mentioned—the housing program, food, health care, and ecological safety.

I also have to note simply, with satisfaction, that the essence of the Estonian concept of IME [Estonian self-management]—that is, pluralism of the forms of ownership and free enterprise—gets more backing in the report than the so-called Maslyukov option.

For the moment it is impossible, of course, to bring the market economy mechanisms fully into play: Under conditions of budget deficit this would result in a sharp rise in prices. Nonetheless, it will be the market which will show up the competitiveness of specific forms of ownership and economic activity.

It was also correctly noted in the report that, while we are formulating our economic ideology today, we are lagging in creating the economic groundwork, that is in the elaboration of the economic mechanism and of a system of appropriate regulators. Our IME system bears this out, though the deadline—1 January 1990—will make it necessary for us to work flat out and create the economic groundwork which will enable us to translate our plans into reality.

Estonian Deputies View First Week of Congress

PM1506152389 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 1 Jun 89 p 2

[Report by ETA special correspondent L. Sher: "Congress of Surprises"]

[Text] Moscow, 30 May—Of course, I wanted to begin this report with the fact that Ivar Rayg had been proved wrong in our "argument"—M.S. Gorbachev's report was indeed deferred. However, I think I do not have my own insight to thank for this but Mikhail Sergeyevich, who clearly wanted to gain a little more time to prepare for this highly crucial report on our country's present and future.

But it really has been a congress of surprises. Could we have imagined even a year ago, say, that a whole day would be given over to debates on procedural issues? Could we have imagined even yesterday morning that, by evening, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, who had failed to make the grade in the elections, would be a member of the Supreme Soviet? And, I must be honest, after such criticism and such questions it would have been hard to imagine that Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov would be voted against by fewer than 200 people in the elections for the position of first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. It seems hard to explain away this phenomenon by the monolithic unanimity of deputies from Central Asia and Kazakhstan alone.

Totally unexpected, probably inconceivable in any other parliament in the world, was the statement by a deputy from Kazakhstan that the congress should move ahead more quickly because the school holidays were fast approaching.

Every day of the congress has brought its own heroes—on both sides. On Thursday it was Obolenskiy and on Saturday the "hero" was deputy Samsonov, who demonstrated his commitment to the principle "hold on and do not let go!" in all its glory. Yesterday the real hero was Kazannik, an assistant professor from Omsk, who conceded his legitimate place on the Supreme Soviet to B.

Yeltsin, thereby defusing an extremely sharp, tense situation not only in Moscow and the Moscow region but also in Volgograd and a number of other places in the country.

So, 29 May passed in heated debate and unexpected events. What did this day show?

A. Ryuytel: Today took us another step along the road to democracy, because there were a great many speeches, the things said were sometimes very pointed, and there were also general discussions which produced very little. But I would still sum up the day like this: A step closer to democracy.

Correspondent: How do you feel about the way the Boris Yeltsin question has been resolved?

A. Ryuytel: I think—and this has been remarked upon at the congress—that Yeltsin represents the whole of the Moscow public; this is confirmed by the number of votes in his favor. His absence from the Supreme Soviet created a certain vacuum. That vacuum has now been filled.

I. Toome: I think that the secret ballot at the congress showed deputies' opinion of Yeltsin both as a politician and as a man, an individual. But, in my view, the decision made by deputies today attests to their great political wisdom, because 5 million voters were in Yeltsin's favor; whether we like it or not, he represents the interests of a considerable number of people—their political, social, and other interests. Thus, the whole body of deputies, as demonstrated by the vote, felt that this man should be a member of the Supreme Soviet.

Yesterday evening proved tense for many of our deputies. Journalists "tormented" not only A. Ryuytel and I. Toome. Ukrainian television reporters, for example, selected as their "victims" V. Palm and V. Yarovyy, although very few of the others were able to sit in peace. And I am not only talking about members of our delegation. The central question and the central report of the congress were coming up the next morning. Most of the statements on this, although made by just one deputy, are the fruits of the collective intellect and collective work of the deputy groups. I. Toome is the first to enter the fray on our behalf. It is hard to say exactly which version of the text of his speech I held in my hands this morning—even that was possibly not the final version, as the congress is without precedent in the history of our country, is unpredictable, and every hour of its work brings fresh surprises.

On the morning of 30 May, the voice of M.S. Gorbachev was heard coming from every window in Moscow—from the windows of apartments, institutions, and cars. One must suppose that quite a lot of labor output was lost during these 2 hours. Was this loss justified, in the opinion of people's deputies, and did the Supreme Soviet chairman's report live up to expectations?

Unfortunately, here my colleague from NOORTE KHYAEL, Toomas Sildam, is in an incomparably better position than I: Accredited to the congress, he was able to interview representatives of our republic directly in the Palace of Congresses immediately after the report. I, on the other hand, am forced to wait until evening and feed on "crumbs from another's table" in the meantime—an interview with Reyn Otsason by T. Sildam.

[Otsason] It was a very balanced report, of course, and made from the standpoint Gorbachev considered correct. If we consider it from the standpoint of our republic's economic accountability, two facts have to be taken into account. First, in the speeches made at the congress so far by the country's leading workers, exceptionally great attention has been devoted to self-management and self-financing. This emphasis is in our favor. Gorbachev has taken a step forward but has yet to reach the crossroads from where the road to radical change really begins. There is still a possibility of taking the road of that hybrid we call the "Maslyukov project." Mikhail Sergeyevich has not yet selected his path.

The second important point is a critical sentence in the first section of the report, when he said that, while radically restructuring the economy, we cannot transfer to a market economy. But our project envisages precisely this. So there are a lot of discussions ahead of us. We are sure that our stand is correct. We have to work to ensure that the last item on the agenda, "Miscellaneous," includes the question of Estonian Self-Management (IME).

[Sildam] Are all 2,249 deputies ready to discuss this question?

[Otsason] I think far from all are ready for this—only a minority.

... The chairman, Deputy Nishanov, has announced that 440 people have put their names down to take part in the discussion.

Lithuania's Landsbergis Interviewed on Congress

PM1606143789 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 1 Jun 89 p 2

[Interview with People's Deputy Vitautas Landsbergis by own correspondent V. Mikhaylov: "All Power—To Whom ?"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] [Mikhaylov] In your opinion, how much closer to the practical implementation of the principle "All Power to the Soviets!" has the congress moved during the past few days of its work?

[Landsbergis] This goal is still a long way off, and there is no question yet of the soviets' having real power. The attitude of the present authorities is not what it should be. However, every day that passes is a step toward a

better understanding of the situation as a whole. A clarification and demarcation of positions is under way, and up to a point that is natural, that is how it should be.

[Mikhaylov] How do you assess Deputy B. Yeltsin's speech?

[Landsbergis] The speech was to the point, it was meaningful, and problems were defined more clearly than in M.S. Gorbachev's report. Representatives from the republics appreciated especially that B. Yeltsin emphasized the need for decentralization and unreservedly expressed himself in favor of republican economic accountability. He also warned against the danger of concentrating power in one pair of hands or within a narrow circle of people, without any mechanism for supervision of the exercise of power.

[Mikhaylov] In your opinion, what decision should the congress adopt during the remaining days so that it can be described as successful, or even epoch-making—as, for some reason, people are already doing?

[Landsbergis] The congress will have to repeal some laws, because it has all the powers necessary to do so. If it fails to do so, that is if it does not repeal a single decree or law, say, from among those which everyone has in mind, which are quite plainly bad and unconstitutional, it will hardly be possible to describe the congress as successful. Although the congress is not wielding any real power as yet, it has nonetheless been invested with great powers, potential powers which it does not know how to use as yet. It is like a giant who does not know how to walk.

[Mikhaylov] But are not the deputies from Moscow, Leningrad, and the Baltic Republics trying every day to teach him how to walk, as it were...?

[Landsbergis] Up to a point—yes, but so far they have been mainly playing with him. These games are detrimental to the congress. Yet, if the congress had more time, it could, without undue haste, achieve a great deal, it could give its attention to the Constitution. It could, at the very least, put certain things right in this unworthy Constitution in which there are so many discrepancies. And it could, as I have already said, either adopt new laws or repeal others. I must stress that, unless the congress does this, it will cause great disillusionment. If we have come to the conclusion that the economy is in ruins, then we must make someone answerable, that is to say, the cabinet must resign. So far there has been no mention of this, frankly.

[Mikhaylov] Of all the proposals that have been put forward to date at the congress, which do you regard as most constructive, as calling for immediate implementation?

[Landsbergis] There are very many proposals from major ones, such as for instance the proposal by Academician A. Sakharov which has subsequently been mentioned more than once—that the congress must adopt a decree specifying that it is the supreme authority and that the Supreme Soviet is merely its apparatus which has its limits and strictly defined powers—down to such a partial but equally fundamental proposal as the repeal of the amendment to Article 11/1.

[Mikhaylov] Do you see any candidacies which would provide a real alternative to N. Ryzhkov's for confirmation in the post of chairman of the Council of Ministers?

[Landsbergis] It is obvious that the prime minister will be chosen from among the Muscovites. Although it need not be so. Active, resolute people should be nominated for this post, people who have not been ruined by a long climb up the power ladder. Because that climb makes them forget how to think independently.

[Mikhaylov] Many proposals on procedural questions are in my opinion very reminiscent of the "invention of the bicycle." That is, what we get is some sort of simplistic, distorted, childlike "translation from the English," that is, a translation of parliamentary traditions which have taken centuries of polishing into our own Russian language...

[Landsbergis] Yes, we still don't know how to vote.

[Mikhaylov] I remember, on the first day of the congress proceedings, you had to explain the finer points of this procedure from the rostrum...

[Landsbergis] It is still going on. There are alternative proposals, yet only one proposal is put to the vote, and it is not even the one that was submitted first.

[Mikhaylov] One gets the impression that by no means all the specific proposals that deputies have put forward from the rostrum are registered and examined without fail. Some of them are simply left hanging in the air...

[Landsbergis] It is constantly being promised that they will be published somewhere, then they cannot be found, so part of the proposals is lost. Yet very important questions have been raised. There is a standing order which states that every question from a deputy must be answered within 3 days. There are questions which were submitted to the presidium on the very first day, 25 May, and they still have not been answered. The standing order is constantly being violated. This is why tension is mounting in the hall. Tension based on uncertainty. Fortunately the congress is beginning to realize that it is not up to the mark, that it cannot stand up for itself. This makes some deputies want to shrug it all off, while others, seeing what things are like, think: "Enough, why should I rack my brains over it...."

However, to be able to look our voters squarely in the face, we must fight to the end.

Lithuanian Deputy Interviewed on Congress Factions

PM1606135989 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 4 Jun 89 p 3

[Interview with Deputy Romualdas Ozolas by V. Mikhaylov: "The Nationalities Question Is the Main Thing"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Mikhaylov] The congress has still not specified its position and is wavering on the question of power, which not only irritates the deputies themselves but also the millions of voters who are avidly watching television and listening to the radio. If you give it some thought, how do you see the transfer of power process?

[Ozolas] The question of power is being resolved outside rather than at the congress today. The congress is proceeding in a very pitiful way; it is lagging behind the people. The moment when the epicenter of the struggle for power and the reins of the country's government could have been kept in the Kremlin, at the congress, was lost at some point. But this could certainly not have been done after Gorbachev failed to agree to an alternative candidacy, that is, Obolenskiy, and did not express sympathy with or support him.

That is pardonable. We know that the situation is complex. We should not jest. Gorbachev must be president. But as soon as he was unable to organize alternative elections for his deputy, everything, the congress, went out of the window. It was then that real power began to move away from the Kremlin. I do not know what will happen or how, but power is now in the hands of the people, who are still not fully self-aware.

The whole question now is how long it will take for the people to be able to express their indignation with certain forms of political opposition.

[Mikhaylov] How feasible is the creation of factions at this congress to enshrine pro forma the polarization of deputies?

[Ozolas] I think that one faction already exists, irrespective of whether it is really acknowledged or not. It already exists. You see that the body of deputies is constantly being divided into an aggressive conformist majority and a more radical minority. The majority is quite uniform because it is united by uniform thinking geared toward submission.

There is another smaller group of very varied people, each with his own persona and convictions, and it is only now that certain deputies are beginning to form groups. People say that it is necessary to join forces on political and business problems. I think that everything is now becoming very clear. Every republic is a problem. If we remove these problems, we see that the nationalities problem is the main problem, and it is this that unites the radical minority. Nothing will happen without the resolution of the nationalities question and national statehood.

By the way, it is very gratifying that democratic Muscovites already realize this.

[Mikhaylov] Yet the Moscow group was united above all by social and general democratic problems rather than nationalities problems. The speeches by Sakharov, Afanasyev, Vlasov, Chernichenko, and Popov proved this....

[Ozolas] I believe that that was the original form of their association. In this case you can certainly talk about a Russian tradition, consisting in political ideas suppressing national ideas and all questions being resolved by political means.

[Mikhaylov] As far as I know, you recently had a meeting with A.N. Yakovlev. Did the Lithuanian delegation feel more optimistic after that meeting?

[Ozolas] The meeting was organized at our suggestion. We talked about various things. The question of events in Georgia was heated. Yakovlev gave us a long explanation about how the top leadership in the Kremlin may not even know about events on which local authorities make independent decisions, and he cited the cables that A.I. Lukyanov read out as proof of this. This entire explanation did not seem particularly convincing to me.

Then we talked about the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. The Central Committee secretary did not add anything new on this problem, apart from the fact that Arbatov and Falin and representatives of Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Moldavia were included in the commission of deputies at his suggestion. Yakovlev stressed that he himself is interested in an objective and impartial investigation.

After this the conversation turned to different things: the possibility of providing compensation for the damage done to people who suffered repressions, the need to bring the remains of the dead from the Siberian camps to Lithuania, and whether Yakovlev would help get railroad stock for this.

[Mikhaylov] The day after your meeting with A.N. Yakovlev, Deputy Peters defended the interests of the Baltic region in his speech. How successful do you think he was?

[Ozolas] I think that this was the best speech of the day. Peters touched on many problems that Professor Landsbergis had touched on the day before, and voiced a

particularly specific opinion on the Army. The range of Peters' speech was very diverse, and I think that he conveyed our pain and hope to deputies. [passage omitted].

Lithuanian Rally Commemorates 1941 Deportations
LD1606123589

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0000 GMT on 15 June broadcasts a report on the commemoration of the Stalinist deportations of Lithuanians to Siberia in 1941 and after WWII. At the commemoration in Kaunas, the second largest Lithuanian city, Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, spoke. He said:

"It is impossible to (?destroy) the memory of the nation. We gathered here today at the behest of history and according to the wish of the people. We gathered here at the foot of our statue of liberty, because 49 years ago not only were the Lithuanian people deportated to distant lands, but attempts were also made to deport our freedom from us, to take away our belief in life and in the future. The fact that thousands of people have gathered here from all over Lithuania testifies that the attempt to deport our freedom from us has failed. True, tens of thousands of residents of our country did not see the skies of their motherland again. We will never forget this. The vastness of north Siberia is studded with crosses of rememberence of the Lithuanian people.

"For decades we have been silent about this, but the time of silence has come to an end. Today we must say that Lithuania remembers everybody who was torn away from his home, family, and birthplace, and did not come back. Not every one of them has yet been named, but I believe that there will be such a book of the nation's memory, where each name will be included, both of those who returned and those who departed to their eternal rest far from their loved ones. We have declared loud and clear to everybody that people were deportated without any legal or moral grounds. They did not commit crimes either against their country or their neighbors. It is difficult and perhaps impossible to compensate for the moral harm inflicted. Years spent in prisons, labor camps, exile, and lost health cannot be returned. However, there is also material harm, which we have no right to forget and which we must compensate. Perhaps we are not successful in compensating it as quickly as we would like, but I am sure that no one will be forgotten.

"We cannot and we have no right to forget the history of the nation. There was not only 14 June 1941, there was also 15 June the year before. Military troops of the neighboring great country, which outnumbered the Armed Forces of the Lithuanian Republic by several times, crossed Lithuanian borders. Harsh arguments are taking place today what this action should be called. One can give various names to it but the essence of it remains: A huge state of the world decided that it did not have to reckon with the small one. Those who decided Lithuania's destiny half a century ago and believed they were right are no longer with us right today. Now we are here, in Lithuania, and it depends on us how we are going to live here in our land."

Following this speech, Ceslovas Stankievicius, chairman of the Kaunas Sajudis Council, spoke of the nation's awakening after the planned extermination of the Lithuanian spirit by the Stalinists had failed.

At noon, church bells all over Lithuania began to ring. The participants of the rally marched to the Kaunas railway station, where Lithuanians were sent off to Siberia. The crowd stopped at Vytautas Avenue, in front of the KGB building, where they shouted "bloodsuckers" and "hangmen." After a wreath was laid on the spot of the future monument to the deportees, the participants of the rally went to a park where a concert was held; sacred hymns as well as national songs were sung.

Lithuanian Hunger Striker Wins Prisoner's Release
PM1606134189 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 6 Jun 89 p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] It has already been announced that the 11th Session of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet formed a commission of deputies to examine a question from a group of USSR people's deputies and Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet deputies regarding the hunger strike declared by P. Tsidzikas, a member of the committee to save political prisoners, in Vilnius on Gedimino Square. The commission presented its findings to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. By a decree of 5 June this year the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium pardoned Boleslovas Lizunas, in view of his age and the fact that he has served two-thirds of his sentence. B. Lizunas has been released from serving the rest of his sentence.

Rally for Latvian De-Stalinization Held in Riga
LD1806140189

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1500 GMT on 14 June broadcasts a live 98-minute relay from a "People for de-Stalinization of Latvia" rally held on Doma Square in Riga. Unidentified reporters begin by saying that at Rezene, Saldus, and everywhere in Latvia there have been remembrance rallies and wreath-laying ceremonies at memorial monuments. Awakened by the voice of the People's Front, people are flying the Latvian flag accompanied by black ribbons of mourning. The reporters describe the mass deportations of 14 June 1941 and how families have tried unsuccessfully to reunite.

At 1505 GMT the church bells of Riga toll and the rally begins. Following funeral music, unidentified speakers recall unhappy memories of the deportations. At 1515 GMT there is a break in transmission for 3-minutes. When transmission resumes, an unknown speaker is giving the opening speech at the rally. He discharges those who hail the achievements of the Soviet power in Latvia in 1940-41 "what poets Aleksandrs Drizulis and Eriks Zagars" wrote in their collection of fictional literature, 'The History of the Latvian SSR'" [Soviet Socialist Republic] and he greets the "ideological opponents of the above-mentioned Soviet power throughout Latvia," those for whom this is not an anniversary of achievements and undertakings of the antipeople system, but a moment to remember that terrible year's culmination and to protest against the unprecedented genocide. He says this is what is partially continuing at present, but instead of by deportation, it is being done by sending people in, by "assimilation, and ecological and economic genocide."

The speaker goes on: "We have fallen to the limits, beyond which begins not the bright future once promised by the tanks and the party, but nonexistence and death. However, it is important that we know now that our only choice and the only road of life—if we want to call ourselves human beings, and if we want to call ourselves a people—is freedom in a free, restored state of Latvia. This can be the only meaning of 14 June [applause]." Only this, he says, could be a worthy monument to the victims of the repressions of that and later years. Their dying consolation was the hope that Latvia would live on. Seeing the awakening of the people at present, the souls of our innocent fellow countrymen come from the other world to join our ranks, reminding us that it is not tears but work, unity, unselfishness, and struggle that will "enable us to get there where Mother Latvia calls us," enable us to get out of the kingdom of darkness, and "that truth and faith will again bring light to Latvia."

The speaker says that the Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow had already proved that foundations of colonialism and imperialist thinking had become unsteady in the Soviet Union, that peoples are standing up to defend their right to their land, property, and self-determination. He says this is a natural law. "The inescapable downfall of an empire cannot, after all, be prevented by clubs, sappers' spades, or by tanks." The old regime has brute force and its fanatical adherents but it no longer has any ideas enabling it to unite and subjugate those who are thinking independently. The old power does not wish to share power honestly and justly, "but we must do so in order to ensure the physical, national, social, political, economic, and ecological security of Latvians and of the national groups of Latvia, in order to be able to protect our women and children in an independent Latvia," he adds.

"In Moscow we became convinced that it is not possible either to request or to demand freedom, it must be taken and be created by oneselves. [applause] It must be created by ensuring one's economic independence, by proclaiming one's land and economy as the property of the people of Latvia, by a new constitution and a new parliament from the republic's elections. We must also prepare deputies for the next session of Latvia's Supreme Soviet, which will already have to decide these questions," the speaker says.

The speaker continues: "Freedom must be created by de-Stalinization of present-day Latvia. At last the culprits of the repressions, those who were decorated and given personal pensions, must be called to account as criminals against humanity. [applause] Let them know that the hour of reckoning has come, let the inheritors of their ideas see this.

"And if we do not want to experience new tragedies, of course we must separate ourselves from the Soviet Union, Central Asia. [prolonged applause and shouts of approval] Yes, we must separate ourselves from that country, especially from Siberia, Central Asia, from the northern regions, where the bones of citizens of the Republic of Latvia still continue to bleach white in the sun. But, in the future, only equal economic agreements must be concluded very cautiously with these regions and also with other republics of the present Soviet Union.

"As a sovereign country, we must conclude an agreement with the Army. First of all, we must get our sons to serve on the republic's territory. [applause and shouts of approval]" The speaker then describes how this was discussed at the Congress of People's Deputies, and the determination of Georgian women not to allow their sons in the Army go outside Georgia.

He goes on: "We are not alone. At the present moment we are linked through an agreement of friendship and mutual assistance with the people's movements of Estonia and Lithuania. [applause]" We have solidarity and fraternal feelings with other oppressed peoples, he says. Crimean Tatars, too, are holding a solidarity meeting today to remember the repressed citizens of Latvia.

The speaker goes on: "Today we received information that in proud and free-thinking Lithuania an intensified movment of troops, a demonstration of force has been observed. At the present moment this is also happening in the vicinity of Riga.

"But let the generals and the Inter-Front know: We can be driven into homes; we can be silenced for a moment, but it is no longer possible to stop our march of freedom. [applause and shouts of approval] [Words indistinct] we can no longer be forced to serve and forced to obey that totalitarian regime which has torn at us and humiliated us for so long, and with impunity.

"Latvia has breathed the air of freedom, and the people of Latvia will not become slaves. [applause]" When asked about the slogans heard in Tbilisi for which

women and children had to be killed, General Rodionov, "the practical coordinator of the murders of Georgia," affirmed the there were anti-Soviet and antisocialist slogans. The speaker then shouts: "Long live free, independent Georgia," which receives applause from the crowd.

The speaker says those in power fear most of all the words "freedom and independence." Oppressors and dictators feared these words, and the socialists here fear them. These words are stronger than tanks and armies, than empires and authoritarian regimes. "it is only because of these words that the deaths of our dear ones in foreign parts has not been in vain." In their memory and in the name of the future "let us cherish the dream of a free and independent Latvia," through struggle and work let us see that a free Latvia will live forever. The speaker ends by asking the forgiveness of those killed "because we made you wait so long. [applause]"

The live relay continues with (Igors Noskovs), chairman of the Repressed Persons Club, describing the history of Stalinist repression. He says that when the "Red terror" began in 1919 Stalinism was already alive "because Stalin did not make the system, but the system made Stalin." Stalin was a fruit of the tree of the system. In recent years the terror has calmed down, but there are no guarantees, because as recent examples show the ideologists of terror were still alive. "The executioners and terrorists must receive punishment," he says, and their crimes must be proclaimed crimes against humanity. (Noskovs) says there are only two ways: "Latvia or death."

The next speaker is lawyer Andrejs Skrastins, a member of the Latvian National Independence Movement, who says: "Today is a day of anger, when we curse the enslavers, murderers, and betrayers of our people." But this is also a day of hope, he says, with pain and hatred giving new strength in the fight for freedom and independence. Skrastins quotes the Bible and says: "We demand punishment for the surviving sadistic murderers who 49 years ago invaded our country and, together with home grown quislings, flooded the land of Latvia with blood and tears, and sowed extermination among its people. But of whom do we demand this? Of the power which still rules over our land? This power holds the murderers of the people of Latvia in honor and esteem. It has decorated them with spangles of honor, and provided them with everything necessary for their old age."

Skrastins says the Latvian people had been tortured, but there was no power in the world which can destroy its spirit, which is striving for freedom. "The empire of slave-holders, the USSR's autocrats and its servants, understand that the most dangerous thing to their empire of hatred, darkness, and evil is the spirit of light and freedom". This is why freedom and those craving freedom are condemned to death, he says. Skrastins ends by saying that rather than building monuments to the dead "in the name of those who departed, suffered, and died we, the living, must restore a free, independent and democratic Republic of Latvia."

The next speaker on the live relay from Riga's Doma square is actor (Voldemars Karpacs), who speaks as a representative of the group for the restoration of the Latvian Social Democratic Party. He talks of the social democrats who suffered in the June 1941 deportations and vows in their names to do everything in their power "to win true independence and freedom for our native Latvia."

The next speaker is (Einars Silinskis), a member of the Environmental Protection Club, who talks of the best sons and daughters who perished together with the independent State of Latvia. He says: "We must understand that the only monument worthy of them would be the restoration of the Republic of Latvia." But there will never be an independent state of Latvia if we are afraid to seek it. A realistic way for its restoration has been outlined: "This is the establishment of citizens' committees. The de jure state of Latvia exists. Citizenship in the Republic of Latvia exists. We must restore it in practice." (Silinskis) says that some object that it is still too early, "but what do we want to wait for when due to a chemicalizd agriculture the ecology of Latvia is perishing, when every day the death trains of ammonia go through Latvia, when crowds of migrants come here from all parts. It is not possible to demolish this system by force. Our way is the way of truth; our way is the green way, because human beings cannot live without interaction with nature.

"Our truth is stronger than the prison walls, the tanks of Adazi and the swarms of the State Security Committee's [KGB] informers. But do not think that the day will not come when the archives of Corner House [KGB headquarters in Riga] will open, when the truth concealed for decades will be revealed. I think that in the light of this truth our hatred wil also disappear, leaving only bitterness," (Silinskis) concludes.

Next, Jazeps Pigoznis, member of the cultural council of the Latvian creative unions and deputy chairman of the Latvian Union of Artists, in his address doubts whether numerically large peoples were really capable of feeling what it meant, what it means for a numerically small people like the Latvians to bear this heavy sacrifice of deportations. This wound has not healed. "We are demanding justice, we want to be a democratic society". He says that such meetings are necessary as long as injustice continues. Pigoznis concludes by calling for a return to the use of Latvian-language names for all geographic places and streets, etc, in Latvia.

Next to speak is Martins Abolins, a member of Helsinki-86, Latvia's human rights protection group, who begins his address by saying that "in talks about Latvia's de-Stalinization, one also must talk about de-Leninization and de-Sovietization." On the day of mourning, one

should mention those shot at Litene, "the members of our last real government, and our last president Dr Karlis Ulmanis," and remember our fellow-countrymen lying in unknown graves in Siberian camps, in the permafrost of the Magadan iron mines.

"This remembrance on its own is inadequate, because neither their organizers nor participants have admitted these evil deeds," Abolin says. He calls for trials and punishment for those guilty of repression in Latvia, and adds: "The time will come when it must be demanded that the Soviet Union hand over the archive materials to a special international tribunal under UN leadership. [applause] There must also be a tribunal of Latvia which would be elected by the citizens of Latvia. This would serve as a warning to those who still think that a mass-scale dispatching of people to their deaths while sneering at their agony can be condoned."

Martins Abolins continues his speech, saying: "This is also our day of hope. In Latvia it is splendidly understood what imperialism implemented by the Soviet means, and the loss of freedom and statehood that followed 1940 and in the course of World War II.

"This annexation was condemned by many freedom-loving countries, among them the United States of America. Therefore we are inspired with hope when we hear mention of the resolution adopted in the U.S. Congress by which President George Bush proclaimed this day 'Baltic Freedom Day.' [applause]

Aboling says Latvia is the loot of the Soviet imperialists, but this acquisition has certain limits, and sooner or later it will become an unbearable burden to the Soviet Union. He adds: "We ourselves must make this burden heavy".

"We must recognize that it is not because of good will that the USSR began the so-called restructuring. Only the firm stance by the Washington administration and the dangerous adventurism of the USSR itself lead to a dead-end road for this state of proletarian dictatorship—the already economically impoverished and weakened Soviet Union." Abolins says every year the Soviet Union's citicizens are living better. Otherwise, how could Mikhail Gorbachev have been elected "even without accounting for 4 years full-of-successes of the so-called restructuring—and achievements there are: a shortfall of food, goods of primary necessity, and housing; inflation, speculation, criminality, and increasing alcoholism."

Abolins continues: "We must recognize that socialism has never in any place been able and will never be able to establish social justice and socal equality; it will not allow a person to become a human being, a personality, only a human factor."

He says: "Do not believe in the promises of the Soviet Union, in the slogans of the so-called restructuring, because this system has trodden hundreds of agreements underfoot. To believe in them is the same as to believe in the scribblings of Karlis Pakalns in the newspaper CINA. [applause]

He asks for a little attention to the minority Helsinki-86 group's ideas. The minority was in vogue now. "Now some were even saying that the minority had won at the Moscow congress. This congress created all the preconditions for the development of a new Stalinism. The congress dispelled many illusions about democracy".

Abolins says the Helsinki-86 group, Latvia's National Independence Movement, the Latvians in exile, a majority of the Latvian people, and the people's Front of Latvia wish only for an independent Latvia. "Therefore, let us no longer pretend, let us not be hypocritical, because if you do not want to become reconciled with the occupation, your stance must be inflexible: no kind of elections under conditions of occupation, no kind of compromises. The existing system is without a future, one must not trade with it, no kind of agreements with enslavers concernining the place of Latvia within the composition of the republics of hunger. [applause] No kind of agreements concerning the occupation Army being located in our state, but an agreement on when this Army will leave Latvia, and this time forever. [prolonged applause and chanting of slogans] I repeat, we must show our unchangeable desire for freedom, and then they will travel from Moscow for talks with us, and not the other way around. [applause]"

Abolins concludes: The time for decision is approaching "and we must not become tired, we must protest throughout Latvia, also against the Inter-front, and against Alfreds Rubiks [chairman of the Riga Oblast Party Committee] with the slogan: Riga without Alfreds Rubiks! [shouts of approval and prolonged applause]" "Every one of us must support our people's just demands for freedom. Freedom for Latvia!

Talavs Jundzis, vice president of Latvia's Society of Jurists, notes the differing attitudes of the all-union and republican bodies toward the mass deportations in Latvia. "For the time being the strong center discusses, considers, and establishes commissions," whereas the Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a resolution classifying the deportations of the forties and fifties as illegal and groundless. Jundzis continues by noting the need for Latvia to achieve the excution of only those laws adopted by its own supreme bodies, so that "no decision or law of the USSR Supreme Soviet would come into force without the knowledge and approval of our republic's people's deputies. In this connection the Presidium of Latvia's Society of Jurists has submitted a specific draft law to Latvia's Supreme Soviet together with a declaration of the republic's sovereignty." This is greeted by applause.

Jundzis also addresses the question of compensation for losses and the need to recognize that the Stalinist deportations were a crime against humanity. Speaking of the great hope among the people, he stresses that there are still no guarantees that similar deportations could not happen again. "Can we talk about such guarantees with the adoption on 28 July of a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the rights of the internal Armed Forces, on the Armed Forces which are in Riga on this very day, which are ready at any moment to obey the order of the USSR minister of internal affairs, on the Armed Forces which operate in such great secrecy that they do not even want to meet the representatives of Latvian television." He concludes that Latvia must fight for such guarantees.

A woman who is presumably Sandra Kalniete, secretary of the People's Front, then reads two draft documents for the meeting's acceptance:

"Demand by the Participants at the Meeting of 14 June 1989.

"Forty-eight years, nearly a man's lifetime, have elapsed since that 1,000-times accursed day and tragic night when in the land of Latvians, oppressed by an alien power, the road of agony to Golgotha began for thousands upon thousands of innocent people.

"This road began on 14 June 1941, the day which will be inscribed in black forever in the history of Latvia, in the memory and remembrance of generation upon generation.

"The day of 14 June has become the rallying point for a third awakening of the people. On 14 June 1987 the enraged pack of the authorities' guards had to retreat for the first time with clenched teeth, faced by a handful of brave people. For the first time the force of spirit had taken a stand against power armed to its teeth.

"But as soon as a year later, at the first great march of mourning of the Latvian people to the Monument of Liberty, the red-white-red flag, kept for decades as a sacred thing, was raised.

"A year has gone by. There have been amnesties, concealed and public rehabilitations, and symbolic compensations, but there has not been and there is no justice.

"In the name of justice we demand a calling to account of the initiators and executors of the 14 June deportations, of all who are guilty, and punishment of all who are guilty. This is no call for revenge. This is a demand to observe the elementary norms of international law, to recognize what happened on 14 June 1941 as a crime against humanity [applause], as a crime against humanity which has no expiry date. On behalf of thousands upon thousands worn out by torment, shot, starved, frozen, humiliated, and crippled, on behalf of their children and children's children, we demand that Latvia's Supreme Soviet adopt a decree on calling the guilty ones to account.

"This will be a stern warning to those who warn us still today: We will shoot 1,000 and everything will be in order in Latvia. A warning, a punishment, but not revenge. This cannot be avenged, for Latvians, or Russians, or Jews, or Tatars, or Ingush, or Volga Germans, or any people who fell victim to the blood feast of Stalinism. Today we are thinking about all the peoples who have gone to Golgotha, and therefore we say: A curse upon the murderers and executioners of peoples!"

After applause the same woman continues: "And in order that this could never be repeated again, what took place on 14 June, and a great many years after that, I will read the draft of the second document:

"The Resolution of the Participants at the Meeting of 14 June 1989.

"On 14 June 1941 the Latvia authorities were unable to protect their citizens against the criminal action of the USSR authorities which implemented mass-scale deportations.

"Recent events in Georgia, Armenia, and even the display of military strength in Riga clearly show that an unrestricted dictate of the central USSR authorities over the republic's sovereign rights continues.

"In order to prevent a repetition of these tragic events of the remote and recent past, in order to protect the rights of the citizens of Latvia, we, the participants of the meeting, fully support the demand of the People's Front of Latvia Dome to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet at the session of 27 July 1989 to adopt a declaration on the state sovereignty of Latvia and to make changes in the constitution. [calls of approval and prolonged applause] The people of Latvia have the right to determine the laws for themselves that protect their citizens. [applause]

"Let me regard your applause as your approval for the text of these documents. Thank you."

Following applause the same woman announces that they will walk to the Monument of Liberty along the Smilsu Iela, as published in a newspaper, along Komjaunatnes Iela.

The final speaker is Lutheran Archbishop Karlis Gailitis. He expresses his conviction that God's justice "would once lead us to a free and holy Latvia." After his blessing the full Latvian national anthem, "God Bless Latvia," is sung by the crowd with orchestral accompaniment. Bells are heard ringing as the relay ends at 1638 gmt.

Calls for Sovereignty Reported

PM1606100189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent I. Litvinova: "Call for Restraint"]

[Text] Riga—IZVESTIYA has already reported that 14 June has been declared the day of remembrance of the victims of Stalin's repressions in Latvia. Yesterday members of the Latvian People's Front, the "Helsinki-86" group, and the club for the protection of the environment, as well as representatives of the creative unions and the Lutheran Church, addressed thousands of inhabitants on Riga's Domskaya Square. Many speeches not only contained words of sorrow for the innocent victims of the repressions, but also voiced opinions relating to Latvia's present and the USSR. "Occupation," "annexation"—those were the assessments of the events of summer 1940 in the Baltic republics. The resolution proposed by the Latvian People's Front contains the demand that a declaration on Latvia's sta · sovereignty be adopted at the next session of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Literally the day before the meeting, the Latvian People's Front duma approved an address from its board suggesting that the front's members discuss the expediency of launching a struggle for Latvia's political and economic independence. As the newspaper RIGAS BALS wrote in connection with this address, "if the majority of Latvian People's Front members support this idea, the official goal of the People's Front will be to achieve Latvia's sovereignty within the framework of USSR statehood." The newspaper notes that the board's appeal has had a bombshell effect and has drastically altered the situation in the republic.

This situation has become the subject of examination at an expanded session of the Riga party city committee bureau. It made a critical examination of the new document of the People's Front and assessed it as the destabilization of the situation in Latvia. Concern was voiced that such statements could aggravate the already tense interethnic relations. The party city committee bureau urged the population of the city and republic "to display restraint and prudence and not to allow yourselves to be dragged into the abyss of confrontation, instability, and division according to national and localistic interests."

KGB Investigating Riga Association Fire

PM1906151589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent I. Litvinova report: "Fire at 'VEF'"]

[Text] Riga—Last Sunday Riga's "VEF" Production Association was the scene of Latvia's biggest fire in the last few years.

The fire service duty administration control desk received the alarm signal at 1156. The call had come in from "VEF." Its premises are near the city center. The first fire trucks were on the scene in a few minutes. It immediately became clear that the Riga firemen would not be able to handle it alone. Teams from the nearby cities of Yurmala and Yelgava soon arrived. Servicemen helped. To make matters worse there was a strong wind which spread the flames from building to building. Fighting the fire was made harder by the fact that there were large quantities of plastics in the shops. The firemen had to make their way not only through flames and smoke, but through toxic fumes, too. The seat of the fire was only localized at 1900. In all, more than 170 firemen took part in the operation; some of them were injured.

A number of buildings were completely burned to the ground along with all their equipment. According to preliminary figures, the test [testatornyy] telephone department and the radio-cassette recorder experimental production facility will be out of action for a long time. Considerable material damage has been done. This is tentatively being put at R5 million. No fatalities have been discovered, but it will only be possible to tell whether anyone was killed somewhat later, after the premises have been completely cleared.

Criminal proceedings have been instituted in connection with the fire. An investigation group from the republic's KGB has started work; it is being helped out by staffers from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Prosecutor's Office.

Tbilisi Paper Disclaims Editorial Cited by Rodionov

PM1606141989 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 31 May 89 p 4

[Telegram from ZARYA VOSTOKA Editorial Office staffers to Congress of USSR People's Deputies, followed by statement "Adopted at an Open Party Meeting of the Editorial Office Collective"]

[Text] Moscow, The Kremlin
To the Presidium of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies
Copy to: People's Deputies from the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]

An open party meeting of the ZARYA VOSTOKA Editorial Office collective was held in connection with Colonel General Rodionov's 30 May speech at the congress. We express our fundamental disagreement with the stance taken by Rodionov in assessing the 9 April tragedy. We protest against the use made of our newspaper to back his version of events. We deem it necessary to clarify the situation surrounding the appearance of the 14 April article cited by Rodionov.

The article arrived in the editorial office from the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee on the morning of that same day with instructions that it be

published in the 14 April issue. The meeting established that the original lacked the signatures of the author and of the persons authorizing the article in question. Following publication, the original of the article—which immediately generated a negative response from the collective because of its obvious lack of objectivity—was recalled by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and was never returned to the editorial office. Unfortunately, we failed to establish on whose instructions the article was written. An answer to this question ought to be provided by B. Nikolskiy, second secretary of the Central Committee, who actually led the republic party organization at that time.

Without trying to avoid blame for publishing the material in question in our newspaper, we consider that responsibility for its publication lies with the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, which exercised rigid diktat over ZARYA VOSTOKA at the time.

In conformity with the meeting's resolution, this telegram to the congress and an article on the editorial office collective's stance on this matter will be published in the 31 May issue. We request that this telegram be brought to the notice of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Signed by editorial office staffers: Ioseliani, Patsuriya, Khosroshvili, Esvandzhiya, Adamashvili, Akopov, Alperovich, Amiredzhibi, Akhalkatsi, Buachidze, Busurashvili, Galustov, Gamkrelidze, Gamsakhurdiya, Grachev, Darchiashvili, Ivanishvili, Inoveli, Lomsadze, Lomtadze, Martynyuk, Miroyev, Mchedlidze, Mchedlishvili, Petriashvili, Sadatiyerashvili, Chachua, Shpachenko, Eliava.

Our Stance

Today we are doing something we have never done before—in conformity with a decision by an open party meeting of the editorial office collective held on the evening of 30 May, we publish a telegram to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and we state our stance as expressed by the collective at that meeting.

Today we are doing something we should have done earlier, before the 14 April issue of ZARYA VOSTOKA carried the article "Our Duty Is to Restore Calm in Georgia," which was quoted at such length by I. Rodionov from the rostrum of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies: We express our attitude not only about that article but also about a formula which has ossified over the decades—"The newspaper is an organ of the Central Committee."

Before casting light on the mechanism which caused the appearance of the aforementioned material, we deem it necessary to say this:

The Leninist principles of party-mindedness of the press, just like many other fundamental principles on whose basis the building of socialist society was assumed to take place, were radically distorted during the years of political terrorism, subjectivism, and stagnation. The press turned into an obedient handmaiden of the party-state bureaucracy, a tool to be used by the apparatus which assumed the role of expressing the people's views. Nothing actually changed in matters of form—the mass media had been and still remained organs of the corresponding committees, soviets, and so on. But the point is that, as soon as "socialism was built" in our country—as proclaimed to the whole world—what was essentially a redistribution of power occurred, a kind of silent counterrevolution was accomplished. The people were simply in attendance, with decisions being made on their behalf and—frequently—against their interests. There was not even a hint of the existence of a genuine people's press—its class nature was radically changed.

It was no accident that April 1985 has been called a revolution: The slogan "All power to the Soviets!"—in other words really to the people—started regaining its original meaning and acquiring real content. The reins—or rather the drive belts from the apparatus to press organs—were slackened, even though they were not totally disconnected.

The process of democratization and the affirmation of glasnost is advancing with difficulty, against tremendous resistance from people who are no longer in a position to hold onto power that is slipping through their fingers. Antirestructuring forces are acting decisively and cynically, and the Bloody Sunday of 9 April is just one proof of this. That day, 9 April, also proved that the old mechanisms can get moving at the "right" time, including those which have prevailed for a long time in mutual relations between party committees and their press organs.

At this point it is appropriate to quote the words from a question by USSR People's Deputies M. Belikov, B. Vasilyev, A. Gelman, D. Lunkov, E. Shengelaya, and Ye. Yakovlev in connection with the events in Tbilisi. They write:

"Who is it that decides every time, and why, that at a time of acute clashes it is expedient to switch off glasnost, just as electricity can be turned off at the flick of a switch in emergencies?

"This is what happened in Tbilisi, where all journalists' material was subjected to rigorous censorship. The actual facts which were witnessed by people in their tens of thousands were frankly distorted."

During the April days which were so hard for us all, someone's hand turned the switch of glasnost to the off position.

We declare: Not a single one of the editorial office staffers wrote the article "Our Duty Is to Restore Calm in Georgia" or was directly associated with it. So how did it appear?

On 13 April the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Ideological Department warned the editorial office's leadership that an editorial would arrive from the Central Committee which—we hope that this is obvious—was to reflect the stance of the republic's leading party organ and its attitude to the prevailing political situation. The article was delivered to the newspaper after 0400 on 14 April. It must be noted that Second Secretary B. Nikolskiy was actually exercising leadership in the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee at the time.

Not a single signature or authorization stamp appeared beneath the article. It was immediately typeset and appeared in the 14 April issue. The original article was returned to Central Committee 2 days later on demand from the Ideological Department.

On the morning of 14 April, when we read the article which had been presented as an editorial, opinions were unanimous: The material was clearly unobjective.

In order to ensure that nothing similar occurs ever again, the editorial office henceforth reserves the right to express its opinion, uphold its stance, and offer alternative viewpoints in connection with various material arriving from the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, whose organ ZARYA VOSTOKA happens to be.

Adopted at an open party meeting of the editorial office collective.

OGONEK Editor Asks 'Forgiveness' for Censorship
PM1606110989 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 31 May 89 p 4

[Open letter from Vitaliy Korotich, USSR people's deputy and chief editor of OGONEK, "to the ZARYA VOSTOKA Editorial Office" dated 20 May 1989 and published under the rubric "Letters to Georgia"]

[Text] Dear friends!

Our correspondent recently returned from Nagorno-Karabakh and Tbilisi. We managed to print the article from Karabakh, but the article from Tbilisi was deleted from our issue. When censorship stops material like the truth about events in Georgia, I feel afraid—but not because we are unable to have our say. What I fear are the forces trying to halt the process of spotlighting the truth, to tuck the truth under thick felt blankets, and to dub it provocative. I will never believe that Dzhansug Charkviani, Giya Kancheli, and Robert Sturua—who are as close to me as blood brothers—are capable of harming their people or the land of the Soviets. But their letters were deleted from the magazine as harmful to today's process of consolidation. This is not true. The ones who are dangerous for the consolidation are those who intimidate another people's representatives with chauvinist slogans or a sappers' entrenching tool. The dangerous ones are those who wish to provoke street battles and to bring in the next lot of "saviors" with clubs or automatic rifles with the duty of stopping the people. I recall how E.A. Shevardnadze did everything to ensure that no demonstrators' blood was shed in the seventies—and achieved it. Today those who feel the need to shed blood have succeeded in shedding it. Those who beat up the young people of Tbilisi beat up all of us; these were not just blows aimed at the heart of Georgia—the sappers' entrenching tools were aimed at the heart of restructuring, at the heart of the people's anger, swollen against all the lies offered to us as truth for so many years.

The time of settlement has come—and those who are unwilling to account for their deeds will embark on any crime to scare the people off.

Provocateurs are fatally dangerous—any provocateurs. But those who stifle the truth, who try to conceal information, are working against our country's already difficult process of renewal.

Dear friends, Georgian brothers and sisters, believe me when I say that I shall do everything within my power at the forthcoming assembly of USSR people's deputies to ensure that liars and criminals continue to lose their power. I beg your forgiveness for being unable to tell the whole truth about you which is in my possession.

But I do consider one thing to be important: Your pain is also my pain; when you lose blood, it is as if my own blood is being drained away. I am with you, and the millions of OGONEK readers are with you. We will never feel happy if separated. We will struggle for justice together, and we will emerge victorious together. I shall make my way to the first sitting of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies with this thought in my mind, prepared to struggle for its implementation.

[Signed] Yours,
Vitaliy Korotich, USSR people's deputy.

Academician Bromley Discusses Nationalities Issue
18001181 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 3 Jun 89 p 6

[Interview with Academician Yu.V. Bromley, chairman of the interdepartmental scholarly council for the study of nationalities processes under the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by TASS correspondent A. Aladinskiy: "An Opportunity Equal For All"]

[Text] The process of renewal of our society is today also encompassing the sphere of nationalities relations. Along with this, situations arise which are not infrequently accompanied by sharp collisions. TASS correspondent A. Aladinskiy discusses the causes of emerging interethnic problems and new approaches to their resolution

with Academician Yu. Bromley, chairman of the interdepartmental scholarly council for the study of nationalities processes under the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Bromley] Indeed the growing interethnic tensions within certain republics, the presence of extremists, and occasional outright anti-Soviet tendencies, as well as massive inter-republic movements of populations on the grounds of friction of nationalities and the like cannot but cause concern. This is even more alarming because in spite of the fact that they frequently cloak themselves in a "restructuring veil," they obviously hamper restructuring and can create a threat to it. But, of course, restructuring is not the source of these negative phenomena; their primary causes are quite different.

[Aladinskiy] But after all, for a long time interethnic problems hardly made themselves known in our country.

[Bromley] Well why? They were taking place in the past; we frequently had to write classified memoranda about them. And in a general form, the existence of such problems was even officially acknowledged (for example, in the anniversary speech for the 50th anniversary of education in the USSR). However, in fact, the administrative-command system assiduously stifled them, frequently with the use of the reprehensible bete-noire of nationalism. The sphere of nationalities relations was, in fact, a closed zone. Only praise was allowed here. The cause of all problems was reduced to remnants of the past, foreign propaganda, and poor internationalist indoctrination.

[Aladinskiy] All the same, apparently these factors cannot be completely discounted. But what, in your view, are the fundamental causes of the negative phenomena in the sphere of nationalities relations?

[Bromley] A great deal is conditioned by the deformation of the Leninist nationalities policy in the period of Stalin's cult of personality. In words he was an opponent of assimilation, but in deeds he manifested an open aspiration toward the "simplification" of the country's ethnological structure, which was accompanied by a negative attitude toward the very existence of nationalities groups. Highly indicative in this regard is Stalin's assertion in his speech on the 1936 Draft USSR Constitution that there exist in the country only 60 nationality communities (while even now there are at least twice that number). It is no accident that at about that time forms of national-administrative division, such as nationalities rayons and nationalities village soviets, were eliminated (in the first half of the thirties there had been over 5,000 of them). We cannot fail to recall the repressions against entire peoples "punished" by resettlement to the eastern regions of the country. These were the 1941-1944 deportations of the Germans, Kalmyks, Karachayevs, Ingushes, Chechens, Balkars, Crimean Tatars, Meskhetian Turks, and others, which did significant damage to the national development of these peoples.

Many of the difficulties in the current socioeconomic development of various regions of the country were generated by the command-administrative, supracentrist methods of administration already forming in the prewar years without consideration to the specifics of nationality, at times without elementary respect for the history, traditions, and needs of this or that nation or nationality, and at times with pure arbitrariness in the resolution of ethnic-national problems. The phenomena of stagnation in our society's life during the seventies and eighties could not but leave their mark upon nationalities relations. It was at this time that the republics' differentiations began to multiply in many parameters: The rate of growth of labor productivity and the intensity of disproportions in the provision of labor resources. The differences in the sociocultural infrastructure (housing, medicine, services, etc.) are becoming more significant. In the meantime, as we know, people's dissatisfaction with this or that in the sphere of everyday life is often carried over into the area of nationalities relations.

[Aladinskiy] Nationalities relations are connected not only with everyday life, but with all other sphere of society's life—from the economy to psychology. What do you feel is most essential for improving nationalities relations?

[Bromley] New thinking must be asserted in the area of nationalities policy. Its most important constituent is the concept that in rights and in "beginning opportunities," people of all nationalities must be equal. Yet the concrete paths of development of each of these communities cannot be identical, for the peoples themselves and many objective conditions of their existence are different. New thinking in the sphere of nationalities relations presupposes the acceptance of the admissibility of a great variety of paths of people's development on a socialist basis.

Under the conditions of the creation of a rule-of-law state, those problems regarding the state-legal sphere acquire primary importance. This is first and foremost the course fixed by the 19th party conference toward expanding the rights of union and autonomous formations by delimiting the responsibilities of the union of the SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republics] and the union republics, and strengthening their independence.

There is a need to recognize the elementary fact that all the nationalities inhabiting our country are the subject of nationality rights, and not just those which for some reasons (or at times for the lack of some reasons) received this or that state-territorial status. Let us recall that there are now only 53 national-territorial units in the country, but nationalities number more than 120.

Correspondingly, it is necessary to ensure the satisfaction of the specific interests and requirements of all nationality communities independent of their size and administrative-territorial status, and the complete abolition of any privileges on grounds of nationality in all spheres (from the economy to language and culture). Toward these goals it is necessary to develop (with consideration of world experience and international legal acts) a list of nationality rights of peoples and to assign it to a special section of the Constitution.

At the same time, we must think about improving the national-territorial structure of the country. The problems of raising the status of individual categories of national-territorial formations are in need of special theoretical analysis. Clear limitations of competences of the center and subjects of federation must also be established, having developed the necessary system of "separation of power." Consideration should be given to the issue of granting national groups living beyond administrative-territorial units, or who do not have such units at all (currently a total of 60 million people) the opportunity to create autonomy of a lower echelon (national oblast, okrug, rayon, village soviet). Practice has shown an urgent need to develop precise constitutional regulations for settling collisions among national-territorial formations and, in general, among all territorial-administrative units.

But let us take up the theoretical aspects of the issue of sovereignty, which is now attracting such great attention in a number of republics. At times they have in view almost absolute independence. But such does not occur in view of the well-known law of dialectics; that is, independence in always relative. And in this sense, national sovereignty is no exception. The given situation, in particular, graphically demonstrates the USSR Constitution currently in effect. First, its Article 75 particularly emphasizes that "the sovereignty of the USSR is distributed over its entire territory." Second, in characterizing the union republic as a sovereign socialist state (Article 76), the Constitution also notes that it implements authority in its territory outside the limits of those issues which appertain to conduct by the union in the form of its higher organs of authority. Taking into consideration that autonomous republics are also national-state formations, here is evidently an example of multilayered sovereignty in a federated state. But this, of course, hardly includes the possibility of a redistribution of empowerment among the subjects of a federation of different levels, in particular, the expansion of the sovereign rights of republics.

[Aladinskiy] Judging from appearances, economic reform will have no small significance for the development of nationality relations. I would like to know your opinion regarding the draft of general principles of restructuring the management of the economic and social spheres in the union republics.

[Bromley] What is extremely interesting is the draft's position that self-management and self-financing cannot be limited to the level of union republic, but must also be implemented in autonomous formations and in the administrative-territorial units with a need here for taking into consideration the interests of all national groups.

However, certain positions of the draft cause doubt, let us say, in the issue of demographic policy. The document emphasizes that toward these goals, the republics independently develop and realize regional programs of nationality population. True, in this connection it is noted that this is done for the activization of demographic policy conducted on a countrywide scale. However, as far as I know, the general principles of such a policy have not yet been determined. Moreover, some of our demographers reject the need for them in general, stating that centralization of its implementation could be interpreted in republics with natural high growth rates as infringing on their national rights. However, it seems that various approaches, rather than a unified approach, is more likely to be perceived as a manifestation of inequality. And the question inevitably arises: In the event of differentiated approaches, how, by means of legal norms, can the reduction of population growth be furthered (in certain republics, its high rate is having a number of negative consequences).

[Aladinskiy] Mass migrations have had their effects on inter-ethnic relations in individual republics. In light of this, the limitation of the flow of migration is sometimes linked with the introduction of republic citizenship. What is your opinion on this issue?

[Bromley] Such a limitation obviously contradicts the principles of democracy. It seems that the more acceptable opinion is that the regulation of migration must be implemented by indirect means, first and foremost by economic means, and specifically, by means of the development of highly effective, primarily science-intensive types of production which do not require a significant low-skilled labor force nor, thus, a flow of new migrants.

[Aladinskiy] A great deal of what troubles people of various nationalities relates to the linguistic sphere. Thus, among the issues under discussion today one of the central ones is the issue of a state language...

[Bromley] It seems that the issue of recognizing the state language of a nationality which gives its name to a union or autonomous republic must remain within the competence of the republic, even more so in that it is hardly advisable and practically impossible to deprive those republics which already have a state language. But it is important that the proclamation of a state language in the republics in no way violates the principles of equality of languages of all citizens inhabiting the republics. And in the given attitude, a great deal will depend upon concrete normative acts. In addition, it is necessary to

ensure the free use of the language of inter-ethnic communication in all spheres of public life, having determined its status in the appropriate manner. In view of this, the development of general union linguistic legislation acquires particular significance; today it clearly lags behind the creation of linguistic laws in a number of republics.

[Aladinskiy] To what extent does special linguistic legislation appearing recently, such as the "Law of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], correspond to these principles?

[Bromley] I had the opportunity to acquaint myself with the preliminary draft of this law, and I must say that the adopted law itself contains definite refinements of a positive nature. In particular, its preamble, unlike what was said in the preliminary draft, states that "this law considers the Russian language to proceed from the requirements of general union communication"; that is, it indirectly acknowledges its special role as a language of interethnic communication. It is established that the acts of the organs of state power of the Estonian SSR are published both in Estonian and in translation into Russian (Article 8). However, the same article states that all sessions of these organs are conducted in the Estonian language and translation into the language of interethnic communication is not stipulated. Naturally the question arises: How can deputies and other representatives of the Russian-speaking population participate in these sessions; that is, about 40 percent of the residents, a significant portion of whom know Estonian poorly or not at all?

The position of the law concerning transition to the Estonian language in the sphere of business correspondence of all institutions, enterprises, and organizations located in the republic may have consequences which are difficult to predict. Even though many of the law's articles, as a rule, are accompanied by clauses stating that this must not take place immediately, many of the articles elicit a certain bewilderment. First and foremost, in some cases, time frames for such a transition have already been established. For example, a term of 4 years is allowed for communication among institutions and enterprises within the republic (Article 15, part 1; Article 35).

However, it remains unclear how this transition will provide the necessary language training for the Russian-speaking specialists (especially in areas where the overwhelming majority of the population speaks Russian; for example, in the area of Narva). After all, for such training, in addition to everything else, a significant number of teachers must receive preliminary training so they have mastery of both languages; this requires at least 4 years. Incidentally, providing this and other such measures, including development of teaching methodology and textbooks, is not stipulated in the law. The following position of the law is also unintelligible: In establishing that the local institutions of state administration in which business correspondence was conducted in Russian, the transition to Estonian may be postponed for a certain period, but the law does not allow this situation for Tallinn and its environs (Article 36); that is, it will introduce this transition quickly. Meanwhile, the proportion of the Russian population here is extremely large.

It is easy to continue the list of such puzzlements. I will only note that in preparing such laws, it would not be superfluous to consider foreign experience; for example, that of Canada. Here, as we know, both English and French are considered official languages. However in 1977 in the province of Quebec, where 75 percent of the population is French-speaking, a charter was adopted which placed the English language in an unequal position. As a result, a flow of labor force from Quebec began immediately and, most importantly, the influx of capital investment from other regions of the country decreased, which, of course, could not but affect the province's economy. It is no accident that under the conditions of emerging linguistic tension, the Quebec authorities had to make certain concessions in the use of the English language in the province's territory.

[Aladinskiy] And your attitude toward the concepts negatively characterizing bilingualism?

[Bromley] Unfortunately in recent times this concept has received much press owing to several high-circulation literary essay publications. They cite the supposedly harmful effects on children of early study of two or more languages; it is supposed to retard their mental development. But, as the research of foreign specialists indicates, in actuality children's mastery of a second language at an early age can only assist in the development of their cognitive capabilities, within certain conditions, of course. If these are not observed, certain problems cannot be excluded. In this regard, excellent formulation of the teaching of both languages holds great significance.

[Aladinskiy] How do you regard the tendency today to avoid the concept of "the Soviet people?"

[Bromley] It is important to consider the nationalities processes in our country in a world-historical context. After all, the many millennia of ethnic history of mankind have known the existence of interethnic (metaethnic) communities. They also exist now: The Indian and Indonesian peoples in developing countries, for example; in socialist countries, the Yugoslav people. Thus, the Soviet people are a permissible phenomenon, distinguishing themselves from the majority of similar communities chiefly by their socialist parameters.

Continued Coverage of Bashkir Gas Pipeline Disaster

Train Disaster Casualties Updated

LD1606161289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0508 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Excerpt] According to the latest data, the two trains involved in the Bashkiria rail disaster were carrying 1,284 passengers; 433 of these died during the explosion

and the fire. A further 174 died in the hospital; 3 of these died in the past 24 hours. There are at present over 300 casualties in hospitals in various cities and many of them are in serious condition.

Much equipment has arrived from abroad. Three brigades of army doctors, totalling about 30 people, have arrived from the United States of America.

Zaykov Visits Burn Clinic 14 Jun

PM1606102189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Struggle for Life and Health"]

[Text] Physicians in various medical establishments in the capital are now struggling for the life and health of 151 people brought to Moscow with serious burns following the disaster in Bashkiria. Fifty-seven of them, including 3 children, are in the All-Union Burn Center formed almost 25 years ago at the A.V. Vishnevskiy Institute of Surgery.

On learning of the disaster in the Urals, burn center specialists took the first flight to the scene to aid the victims. Together with their colleagues, the Moscow physicians are now completing the installation of the necessary equipment for further treatment in Ufa hospitals.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee, visited the burn center 14 June. He familiarized himself with the victims' treatment and expressed wishes and recommendations with regard to improving conditions and providing everything necessary. Long-term and priority problems of developing, reconstructing, and modernizing the institute and its burns center and improving their material and technical support were examined. It was deemed expedient to adopt a corresponding Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee decision on the essence of these questions and also to find the necessary resources to acquire additional equipment, medical supplies, and all necessary instruments.

In conclusion, talks were held with medical personnel on further developing health care and on other aspects of life in the city.

Television Covers Zaykov Visit

LD1506024889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our correspondent conducts a report from the Vishnevskiy surgery institute.

Such is human nature: When we are healthy we try not to think about illnesses and that misfortune can befall each of us. We think that this is the doctors' lot, this is their professional duty. Yes, they fulfill their duty, but they, too, have a problem and they, too, need help. [video shows patients in hospital wards, some of them very young]

Comrade Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the first secretary of the Moscow city CPSU committee and comrade Saykin, chairman of the Moscow city soviet executive committee, visited the Moscow Vishnevskiy surgery institute today. [video shows Zaykov and Saykin entering a ward dressed in white coats] They talked to the doctors, employees of the institute, and to the patients.

This is the burn center. Many of those who were struck by misfortune at the Trans-Siberian railway are here. [video shows Zaykov talking to a woman with a badly burned face] Medicine is doing everything necessary, but already now we must draw conclusions to what degree we are prepared for critical situations like these, what should be undertaken so that any tragedy would not catch us unawares. [video focuses on two patients with burns on their faces and arms, Zaykov, surrounded by medical staff, speaks to the camera]

[Begin Zaykov recording] We have looked with the director at the development of the institute, particularly of this burn center. We will now take all the necessary measures to establish normal conditions. This means installing the latest equipment, this means reconstruction and reequipment, and evidently the construction of a new building without increasing the number of beds, but so that we would have a separate room for each sick person, because tragedies can occur. We will, of course, try to ensure that they do not happen, but they still occur and we therefore should create conditions for this. In the next 5 years, the reconstruction of this whole center will be evidently included in our program. There exists an understanding with Comrade Chazov, the minister. The support for this exists and the requests have also been made. [camera continues to focus on Zaykov, then shows a man dressed in white coat entering room, a group of medical staff going down the stairs] [end recording]

Minister Interviewed on Catastrophe

18290198a Moscow GUDOK in Russian 8 Jun 89 p 2

[Interview with USSR Minister of Railways N.S. Konarev by GUDOK special correspondent A. Rostovtsev: "We Will Do Everything Possible"]

[Text][Rostovtsev] Nikolay Semenovich, you were one of the first from among those on the government commission to arrive here, in Bashkiria.

[Konarev] Our commission consisting of 13 persons was set up immediately following the disaster, on the night of 3 to 4 June. After we flew to Ufa we switched to a helicopter right from the plane and set out to the site of the tragedy. It is difficult to put in words what we saw there.

Eyewitnesses gave us very interesting accounts. This is, for example, what engineer Bezverkhiy, whom GUDOK wrote about yesterday, stated: "The night was clear, and the track was clearly visible. Local time was about 0100. When the train entered the 1,710th kilometer, I saw an advancing strip of fog in the rays of the searchlight. However, I understood that this was not fog—the width of the patch was about 30 to 40 meters. As soon as I entered it, I felt the asphyxiating smell of gas. My assistant S. Meshcheryakov—he died—only managed to say: 'It smells of Chernyakovka for some reason' (this is a station in the vicinity of Ufa where very many chemical plants are clustered). I answered: 'This is not Chernyakovka; a gas pipeline is not far from here.' This is when a horrible explosion hit. The front frame of my locomotive with glass was blown out, and I was tossed into this hole together with my seat. I flew several meters in burning clothes, and landed on the shoulder. When I regained consciousness, I saw a firestorm advancing from the forest. I began screaming at the passengers urging them to flee in the direction train 212 was moving."

Incidentally, the passengers confirmed that they survived only due to this instruction from the engineer. Those who ran in the opposite direction perished. Unfortunately, it was so that death caught up with the people not only on the trains.

Another engineer, V. Popov, provided a similar account: "I hit a patch of fog, guessed that it was gas, and pushed the controller down. A terrible explosion rumbled, and the air caught fire immediately. I looked back at the train. All of it was engulfed in flames. My hands literally stuck to the controller, and my assistant, 18-year-old student of the State Vocational Technical School S. Vasilyev literally peeled them off, and pushed me out of the cabin. However, he got very bad burns himself—up to 70 percent.

[Rostovtsev] Nikolay Semenovich, what is the commission working on at present?

[Konarev] We are working on recovering from the disaster more quickly. At the same time, naturally, a thorough investigation of the circumstances of this tragedy is under way. Dozens of those injured are coming back to life. According to the latest reports from many hospitals of our country, 824 persons are being treated there.

[Rostovtsev] One day ago, a meeting between members of the government commission and the relatives and families of victims was held. In all honesty, this meeting left an aftertaste of complete dissatisfaction in me. How would you evaluate the meeting?

[Konarev] In all honesty, this meeting was difficult for me because I again saw the people who experienced a horrible tragedy. You share their bitterness and sorrow with them, you suffer with them. All of them have lost either a son, grandson, father, or wife. We will do everything in order to help these grieving people.

The issues, including those of the work of our commission, were raised in a very principled manner, sharply, correctly. Why have people died? Primarily because of carelessness, in this case, in the operation of the refinery product pipeline. It is the only one in the country. It was built in 1985, from a custom design, with serious drawbacks and shortcomings. Protection systems must be multiple.

Incidentally, we did not even know about the perfidious property of the product. It could be that even then the railroad personnel would have done everything in order to ensure that it had not crossed the track. Now the government commission has taken steps in order to revise the design. It is clear that the maintenance service failed—turns out this refinery product pipeline has already ruptured in 1985, 1986, and 1987. To be sure, at the time there were no consequences of this nature.

[Rostovtsev] We now know what happened on this horrible night. What were the gas [pipeline] personnel doing then?

[Konarev] First, the drop in pressure was registered at 2030. Instead of showing militancy and checking to see what the reason was for this, measures were taken to increase the pumping of liquid mixture. This created greater pressure yet. Quite logically, this brought about still greater outflow of the product, which, according to the data of specialists, turns into detonating gas. As is known, the latter explodes even due to simple shifting in a narrow space.

At present, the task of the government commission is to find those guilty of the death of hundreds of people rapidly and in a detailed manner; this is why we are assigning the task of doing it as soon as possible to the prosecutor's office.

I believe that the commission has treated all issues brought up before it with attention. However, as I see it, we should have treated what the people were saying with more patience, attention, and care. They have lost their loved ones, and we should have been as tactful, responsive, and specific as possible, and should have found exhaustive answers, so that doubts, or, as you put it, unpleasant feelings would not have developed. I think that at our meeting this negative aspect was present, after all.

There were also complaints against us. The manager of the Kuybyshev Railroad could not give precise answers to the questions put by family members of the injured. After all, it is his responsibility to provide complete information on the situation at the site of the tragedy.

Certainly, it cannot be ruled out that the railroad manager was too nervous. However, it behooves him as a transportation commander to always control himself, and be aware of the situation, even more so when he is talking to people who are in trouble.

Yes, the situation is difficult. There is much sorrow around. We will do everything in order to make it easier for the people and help them.

Recovery Work Described

18290198b Moscow GUDOK in Russian
8 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by V. Sluzhakov: "Particularly Dangerous Zone"]

[Text] This is what the railroad has always been considered to be due to its peculiarities. There is an overabundance of internal problems here. However, the movement of trains is frequently brought to a halt by cars stuffed with explosives. The earth is getting crowded with pipelines, and proximity to them ends in trouble. Beyond any doubt, a competent commission will sort out the causes of the misfortune in Bashkiria, and radical decisions on the particularly dangerous zones will be made.

Only Facts

June 1986. Ashkhabad. About 200 persons were badly poisoned due to a defect in a tank car with liquid chloride from the Pavlodar Chemical Plant.

February 1988. Yaroslavl. Defects in special tank cars carrying a highly toxic liquid posed the threat of contaminating the tributary area of the Volga; evacuation of the inhabitants of the station of Privolzhye was required.

June 1988. Arzamas. Explosion of three cars with explosives. Seventy-seven persons died, several hundred were wounded. One version of the causes: a gas leak in the gas pipeline under the tracks. The pipes were laid at a depth of 1.5 meters instead of 5 meters. The investigation is in progress.

October 1988. Sverdlovsk. The explosion of a car carrying explosives was largely due to the lack of compliance with international requirements for packaging and transporting particularly dangerous cargoes. Losses exceeded 100,000 rubles.

May 1989. Alma-Ata. Explosion of special tank cars with propane-butane after a collision on spur tracks. Thirty-two persons died of burns. One hundred persons were admitted to hospitals. Eleven private homes were destroyed. The gas-filling station is situated in the center of the city.

June 1989. Beltsy. Three hours before the tragedy in Bashkiria, a gas pipeline exploded half a kilometer away from the railway. There were no victims.

Deputy Minister of Railroads V. Isingarin happened to work in Armenia in its time of grief. He also flew to the accident site in Bashkiria for restoration work with the very first special flight, with a group of specialists. Here is his report on what he saw:

"The area in which the volumetrical explosion occurred, and in which consequences of the disaster are apparent embraces 8 to 10 square kilometers. A hollow 20 meters deep cuts through a valley descending toward the railway. The main tragedy occurred here.

"The belt of fire which engulfed the railway extended for about 600 meters. It is here that two trains happened to be at the same time. After the explosion, they continued to move under their momentum, and left the active zone of fire. The cars continued to burn. A corridor of burnt greenery along the track is visible.

"A technical unit with cathode protection devices of the refinery product pipeline, with the electric lines going into it, is at the ground zero of the disaster. Some kind of work was being done there prior to the catastrophe. This is exactly where the product was leaking.

"A string of recent sad events makes one think. We have to consider not only the internal problems of the railroad, but also where it runs, and what we carry, after all. Arzamas and Sverdlovsk confirm this. If you will, we have to be aware of the dangers posed by what surrounds the railway, and the people whom we carry. All of those who build something close to the tracks also have an obligation to consider this.

"Unfortunately, it did not even occur to those who operate the refinery product pipeline that they could blow up the railway. We only have control of the right-of-way. In turn, the torch which is still burning is about 800 meters away.

"It is hard to name the cause of detonation at this point. The cars left the tracks away from the torch. The impression is that some of them are bent in.

"It is impossible to forget the picture we saw till one's last day."

—Even after Armenia, where you also had to restore the tracks?

"Over there, this was the result of the impact of blind elemental forces, whereas here it was the doing of people, without pointing my finger at anyone in particular. This makes a lot of difference. Machinery refuses to obey when it is left unattended.

"When we arrived at 0800 on 4 June, the wounded had already been evacuated by the repair and fire trains. The bodies of the dead were all around. The military began collecting the remains when the prosecutor's office gave its consent. This lasted about 4 hours. We began restoration work only after 1300.

"I would not say that there has been considerable damage. The main trouble was with the people.

"Here is a detail: At the location where the pipeline crosses the earth mound the tracks are intact. This indicates that the trouble came from the direction of the technical unit."

—To your mind, could repairs at the unit have somehow caused the accident?

"Hard to say. When the traffic was restored, I decided to go to the torch with a group of specialists. Pieces of molten iron were were strewn up to 300 meters away. An investigation over the entire area is needed in order to determine the causes."

—Unfortunately, all technologies are liable to cause accidents. The issue of setting up special rescue detachments, adequately trained and equipped, is surfacing for the nth time. Given the lack of roads, one can get to the accident site only by air. However, the railways still do not have rapid-response means of delivery. Precious minutes are wasted for coordination and link-ups.

"Are you talking about a national rescue service? It is certainly needed. However, we should also talk about national safety means. Every industry writes its standards itself, and in line with its own interests. We could only control the pipeline in the location where it crosses the mound. Incidentally, earlier this pass was built at a different location, more convenient for the gas industry people. The mound began giving way. Only after the Ministry of Railroads intervened through the Prosecutor's Office, the courts forced the building of the crossing at a different location.

"This is an eloquent example of how the railroad is ignored, because there is no due standard of safety in the interaction of technological systems.

"This is also the case with aid. Those who are in trouble cannot wait until the ministries agree among themselves. There already is an agreement on mutual aid at sea among various countries. We cannot boast a solution to this problem inside the country."

—How did the railway personnel show themselves?

"Among the dead, there are those who discharged their service responsibilities: two train brigades of conductors, two engine crews. They are still establishing how many of them are alive. I cannot fail to mention the engineer of the even-numbered train Viktor Bezverkhiy, who was tossed out of the electric engine by the explosion, got burns, but still made it to the station, and reported the tragedy.

"Specialists of the repair trains did all they could: gave aid to the victims, and made efforts to restore the traffic fast.

"Now we are going to check all crossings of the railway and pipelines. We should meet with their owners once again. Perhaps, these vulnerable installations should not be situated above the railway or settlements, so that in case of a rupture the product would not flow down, putting the lives of people at risk... If the installation were assembled 300 meters further, beyond the valley, the gas would have gone the other way."

—However, the same can be said of the cars. The materials are such that they catch fire immediately. They should protect the passengers from more than just rain and cold.

"It is hard to object to this. However, the things I have seen are astounding: The rail is bent into the shape of steps. A tremendous force is required for that. Only in Armenia did I see the rails torn across. Here, they were not bent, but made into an elbow shape . Very high temperatures are needed for that. It is hard to conceive of a car which would have saved people in the event of such an explosion. Non-flammable materials are being created now. They will help to avoid many tragedies.

Causes of Disaster Discussed

18001207 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Jun 89 p 4

[Interview with G. Vedernikov, chairman of a governmental commission and a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by V. Radzievskiy and A. Terekhin, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA special correspondents, Bashkir ASSR: "The Accident Could Have Been Avoided"]

[Text] [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA] Gennadiy Georgiyevich, your face is very familiar to television viewers because of your presence at the sites of accidents at Chernobyl, Arzamas, Kamenka, Shakhtinsk, and Znamensk. What do you think of the fact that "to put out large fires" seems to have become your second profession?

[Vedernikov] You said it too categorically. At Chernobyl, for example, operations on the elimination of the aftereffects of the accident were headed in turn by many of my colleagues—deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers. In my opinion, selection in the formation of such commissions is determined, first and foremost, by the nature of the work to be done.

[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA] How is this work coming along in Bashkiriya, taking into account the sad experience of previous catastrophes?

[Vedernikov] All the accidents that I have analyzed differ sharply one from the other. It was difficult in Arzamas—not only people perished there, but homes were also severely damaged. They were restored very quickly, and this cost R70 million. In Kamenka it was also frightening to see two coaches flattened like a pancake. And about 100 persons perished there. But in a moral sense, perhaps, what happened in Bashkiriya was worst of all. Two trains, which met at the 1,710 kilometer marker, seemed to be on a gigantic gas-stove burner. It was not difficult to restore the railroad bed, but it was much more difficult to arrange the qualified medical aid that 800 people needed. A lot has already been written about this, so I will not repeat it. I will only say that there were no medical questions at today's meeting of the commission.

[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA] Many were troubled that there are not enough "artificial kidney" apparatuses...

[Vedernikov] We now have 16 of them, and 10 were brought from the United States. I think that this is quite enough, because the use of such an apparatus is an extraordinary fact. Such a need arose only once this evening. But I fear that there are very tragic events ahead—half of the survivors are in an extremely critical condition. And if you take the relatives of those who died? After a disappointing hitch, we were able to establish a network of information centers. Workers of the TsNTI [Center for Scientific and Technical Information] are putting data into computers on each person who was in the area of the disaster.

[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA] Gennadiy Georgiyevich, all kinds of rumors are going around about the causes of the accident. There is even talk about sabotage. Although you are in the preliminary stage of the investigation, could you throw some light on this question?

[Vedernikov] We have been engaged in a clarification of the causes of the accident since the arrival of the first information on the explosion. A large investigative group is at work: employees of the procurator's office, experts, and military personnel. We do not reject any version without a thorough check. It was established, for example, that leaking gas in the area of a break in the pipeline was not noticed in time. Why? While still in Moscow, I gave instructions to remove and take into custody all documents, the journal for recording readings of control equipment, and strip-chart recordings [lenty samopistsev]. Specialists are trying to determine why the break occurred: a hydraulic impact, a defect in the pipe or the seam welding, a breach of construction standards? We still have to find an answer to all of these questions. I will not begin to anticipate events. Only the official findings of the state commission will give the reason for the explosion.

But now I would like to talk about another matter. Chernobyl, Elista, and Ufa are links in one chain. Undoubtedly, errors are possible both in design and in instruction. But, nonetheless, these are exceptions. I am confident: If an object is built strictly according to design, and if technology requirements are met by 100 percent, an accident will not happen. The lack of discipline and professionalism in many places of work—from the ministerial chair to the cabin of the operator of a pipelaying machine—this is the reason for our misfortunes. I am firmly convinced of this.

[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA] Are there questions in your work that cannot be resolved on the spot?

[Vedernikov] The governmental commission has been given extraordinary authority; therefore, such questions simply cannot come up. All departments and organizations of the country are obligated to submit to its requirements. I had to turn only once directly to Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N. I. Ryzhkov with a request to get the government to speed up the acceptance of a document that was prepared by us and which was very important in the task of eliminating the consequences of an accident. The request was settled within a matter of several hours.

[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA] And the last question. The tragedy of Armenia proved once again that our emergency services, for example, civil defense formations, are often simpy not ready to work under emergency conditions.

[Vedernikov] It is precisely for this reason that the Politburo passed a resolution about the necessity to develop a comprehensive system, a single service for the elimination of the aftereffects and, most importantly, the prevention of catastrophes. The service should combine operational rescue detachments, mobile and well-equipped hospitals and specialized centers for providing emergency medical assistance, modern and reliable means of providing supplies to disaster locations, and, what is extremely important, the service should include highly professional specialists from various fields of knowledge, who are capable of identifying the most likely accidents spots beforehand that are similar to the current one. As you see, the question here, first and foremost, is also about discipline and professionalism.

Gas Blast Termed Inevitable

PM1506135689 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Leskov article: "An Explosion of Which There Were Warnings. Scientists Think That the Causes of the Bashkiria Disaster Lay in the Very Approach Toward Gas Pipeline Construction"]

[Text] Volumes, kilometers, millions of items—these are the guidelines of the gross output economy. This is the direction in which the oil- and gas-extracting industry and pipeline transportation develop. Who can forget the deafening victory announcements in the seventies: Yet another section of pipeline laid ahead of schedule; we lay them faster than anyone in the world. Between the 9th and 11th 5-Year Plans the total length of pipelines in the USSR increased by a factor of 2.5, the freight turnover increased by a factor of 9.5, and this increased pipeline transportation's share of the total freight turnover of all types of transportation from 3 to 15 percent. There was also a sharp increase in the average distance over which oil and gas were pumped, from 800 to 2,350 km...

This was a golden age for all ministries associated with the extraction of hydrocarbons. They reported in terms of gross output, and broke all records. Questions of the quality of construction were hardly taken into account. And yet this constitutes an entire science—how to cross rivers, mountainous areas, swamps, massive forests. And appropriate recommendations were elaborated a long time ago...

Ministry leaders are busy issuing orders about the length of pipelines in kilometers and have little interest in technical policy, Prof P. Borodavkin, chief of department at the Moscow Oil and Gas Institute named for Gubkin, believes. You can ask a planner of any rank what pipeline reliability is and what it costs to ensure it, but you will not obtain a competent answer. The dominant principle is: Spend less and build faster.

The underground arteries have a long but not indefinite life. To conceal a pipe 2 meters beneath the surface is not to ensure safety. Reliability is affected by a multiplicity of natural factors—corrosion, the melting of snow, temperature fluctuations, landslips, soil movements. High temperatures and salinity favor these processes—consequently, steel pipes in Central Asia are decommissioned after 6-7 years. Pipelines in the North remain in service much longer, but even there the operating lifetime is approaching the critical mark. Sad though it may be to say this, the accident on the liquefied gas pipeline in Bashkiria came as no surprise to specialists. A bus with people inside it was burned in similar circumstances in West Siberia in 1987. There were numerous incidents before and since that, fortunately in relatively deserted places. The only unusual feature is that two passenger trains happened to be at the site of the gigantic explosion in Bashkiria...

You will scarcely find an optimist who would make a favorable forecast about an end to accidents on commodity pipelines in the next few years. Accidents are simply planned into the ministries' approach toward their work—ministries heed scientists' voices only after something nasty has already occurred and its consequences have to be urgently eliminated. This is what happened during the accident on the Belaya River near Ufa in 1966, at the "Bratstvo" pipeline in the Carpathian region in 1974, and in many other cases. And yet even the nature of pipe deformations at the latest accident in Bashkiria has been well studied by scientists and textbooks show diagrams to illustrate such occurrences.

Many of the pipelines laid in such frantic haste during the seventies are now in downright bad condition. And yet a gas pipeline accident is fraught with the most catastrophic consequences. A single large-diameter main gas pipeline supplies energy for a city of 1 million residents. Each of the largest European and Transcaucasian regions is supplied with gas fuel by just a few large-diameter pipelines; by the way, utilization of such lines in the USSR is double the figure for developed countries.

In my view, Prof P. Borodavkin considers, the northern gas pipelines in the Urengoy region are in the worst condition. The Caucasian group of oil pipelines and the thousands of sections crossing water obstacles, especially the Volga and the larger Siberian rivers, are causing concern.

What is the way out of this situation? It is impossible to close commodity pipelines down for maintenance work—life will come to a standstill without energy. But, seeing that reliability considerations were downgraded during construction, should we not institute painstaking monitoring of the pipes' condition during the process of operation? Especially as world experience can offer quite reliable methods ensuring accident-free operations by pipelines. In the United States and Canada, which, like us, have long-distance main pipelines, the lines are overflown daily by helicopters which analyze the atmosphere for gas contamination.

All developed countries make extensive use of the linealog [laynalog] instrument which travels through the pipe together with the commodity and takes simultaneous readings of six indicators of the pipe's condition—from distortions in shape to corrosion. Data on about 100 km of oil pipeline and 1,000 km of gas pipeline can be obtained in 24 hours. We unfortunately have a shortage of helicopters and seem unable to produce a linealog. Maybe we ought to buy one? One such instrument costs $8 million. Not all that expensive, bearing in mind that imported equipment worth the foreign currency equivalent of R228 million was gathering dust in warehouses belonging to the four gas transportation and gas extraction ministries inspected by the USSR People's Control Committee in 1988. This is one more instance of ministries not being held accountable for the quality of work.

We could also manage without any import purchases. A few years ago the Department for Automating the Design of Oil and Gas Industry Installations in the Moscow Oil and Gas Institute named for Gubkin prepared procedures for diagnosing the technical condition of the line part of pipelines. These procedures make it possible to monitor the condition of pipes without any special expenditure and to forecast the spots where pre-accident conditions will arise. The procedures were approved by the Ministry of Gas Industry long ago, but are still not being used. They have one major "shortcoming." They do not require great material investments and thus make hardly any contribution toward fulfilling the plan and the gross volume of work. In short, to this very day—regardless of the acute need and contrary to world experience—our pipelines are virtually unsupervised.

Diagnostic procedures have been introduced only at the "Prikarpattransgaz" Association, and for 10 years now it has not had a single accident, despite complex mountain conditions. Furthermore, our specialists from the Ivano-Frankovsk Oil and Gas Institute have developed their own instrument for determining stress within pipe walls, but only three such instruments are in existence. It seems altogether impossible to organize series production of this instrument. There is one ray of hope: Britain has expressed interest in the instrument.

Our ministries are working in the same lamentable fashion as the notorious Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources—they are governed by the cost-based mechanism. A lot was said about this at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and the tragic consequences of this approach prove that it is impossible to maintain a gross-output economy in the future.

Can anything be done in the immediate future to ensure that our aging gas and oil main pipelines can cope with their loads? In Prof P. Borodavkin's opinion, the first urgent measure is to set up the diagnostic service whose structure for the Ministry of Gas Industry was elaborated long ago. The main center would be in Moscow, receiving information from four regional centers in West Siberia, Central Asia, the Carpathian region, and the Transcaucasus. The entire service would require the recruitment of not more than 1,000 specialists. The main purpose of the service would be to conduct operational checks using all available means, from space photography to visual checks on foot.

We love saying that oil is "black gold." But are we not paying too high a price for it?

Fire Breaks Out at Ufa Railroad Station 15 Jun

LD1506212489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Ufa: The saga of extraordinary incidents in Tashkiriya continues. Today at Ufa railroad station, a wagon transporting potassium permanganate caught fire. The fire spread to a train transporting industrial goods. It was only the skill and quick action of firemen that made it possible to extinguish the fire quickly and to stop it from spreading. It was only luck, the journalist underlined, which prevented serious consequences. Nearby locomotives which were maneuvering rapidly pulled the wagons apart.

What was it—one more manifestation of carelessness and infringement of the fire safety regulations, or an unfortunate accident? A specially established commission will announce the details of the incident and the amount of material losses.

Locals Fear Accident at CW Destruction Plant

PM1606101989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent S. Zhigalov under the rubric "Returning to a Previous Item": "The Plant Is Safe... Unless There Is an Accident"]

[Text] Kuybyshev—"A Zone Polluted By... Rumors." This was the headline of a report (IZVESTIYA No. 134) on anxiety among the population about a chemical weapons destruction plant near Chapayevsk.

The spontaneous (at first) protest by the inhabitants of Chapayevsk developed into the "Initiative" ecological movement, legalized by the city soviet executive committee [gorispolkom] and headed by teachers, engineers, and lawyers. One of the recent demands made by "Initiative" and the local authorities is for an independent ecological appraisal of the plant. Since IZVESTIYA published the report the appraisal has been made. The commission, compromising academicians, doctors of sciences, professors, representatives of the USSR Health Ministry, the State Committee for Protection of the Environment, and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] and members of the city's public, apparently deemed the chemical agent destruction plant safe. But 2 days later the deputies of the Chapayevsk City Soviet decided at a session to prohibit the plant from operating. Why? Were the rallying residents leading them by the nose?

"No, the deputies made the decision after a comprehensive discussion of the commission's conclusions," Chapayevsk Gorispolkom Chairman S. Sirik replied. "Take these conclusions: 'The proposed technology and the plan for the chemical agent destruction facility are ecologically safe, given trouble-free operation. The commission considers that the USSR Defense Ministry should carry out an evaluation of the worst-possible accident and its consequences. The commission recommends the USSR Defense Ministry to consider the question of transporting the chemical agents on a route that avoids Chapayevsk Station...'

"Neither the deputies nor I can understand the commission's 'given trouble-free operation' proviso. How is it to be understood? After all, what worries the area's inhabitants most is the very possibility of an accident at the plant! They are intending to destroy enormously powerful and dangerous modern toxic agents! In the vicinity of Kuybyshev, Novokuybyshevsk, Tolyatti, and the Volga, too, of course.

"We saw the proviso as a bureaucratic ruse to avoid giving a clear and unequivocal answer. Essentially, the commission has passed on the plant safety appraisal to the Defense Ministry, which has a vested interest. And—we are ready to predict with 100-percent probability what the appraisal will be: Everything is ok, everything is safe...."

The inhabitants of Chapayevsk are even proposing a collection to pay for the construction of a new plant to be built not in the middle of a human anthill, but in uninhabited steppes and wilderness. And to be guided not by how cheaply the facility can be constructed but by guarantees of the safety of the population in all foreseeable situations.

I would point out that the Chapayevsk deputies said no to the chemical agent destruction plant before the Bashkir tragedy. And if a leaking oil pipeline led to that tragedy, who can say what havoc chemical weapons would create if they got out of control?

For many years now there have been explosions at the acid production facility, located near housing in Chapayevsk. In the last 4 years alone more than 10 workers have been killed in these accidents. And what do you know? The facility has sprung up again in the place where it blew up... The citizens are frightened lest the same departmental stereotype come into play in relation to the chemical agent destruction plant: The plant has been built, so let it start up.

'Pamyat' Linked to French Rightist Le Pen

18070656 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 Jun 89 p 9

[Article by Kirill Privalov (Paris): "Moon, Le Pen, and... 'Pamyat'"]

[Text] To begin with—two quotations:

"We pay a lot of attention to establishing contacts with healthy forces in the USSR, China, Poland... Without going into details I shall say that our efforts have not been in vain."

"Jean-Marie Le Pen is the real leader of the French people, the one who defends their integrity and originality, who fights for their purity and traditional values."

The first statement is from the leader of the National Front, Jean-Marie Le Pen. This is what he said when speaking before members of the Foreign Press Association in Paris. And the second is from D. Vasilyev, who was depicted in reports from Moscow (transmitted through the first French television channel) as "one of the leaders of the nationalist Russian association 'Pamyat'." As they say, it is a mutual admiration society... Incidentally, the simplest thing for us in a situation like this is to use angry epithets to describe both "leaders," transforming both into scarecrows.

Would it not be better to do something different: to think about why influential forces in France have recently been trying to convince public opinion of the "outburst of Russian chauvinism and the upsurge of anti-Semitism in the USSR"? The answer to which the average statistical Frenchman is drawn is this: This is where restructuring is leading! Jean-Marie Le Pen is deliberately and methodically pouring oil on the fire. Just a couple of years ago in his book "First—the French," which called the Soviet Union the "main threat to the life and liberty of the French people," he still reserved the right to republish this creation "in all countries, including the USSR." And now the leader of the National Front is putting forth the idea of consolidating people who think as he does from La Manche to the Urals. One of his latest rallies at the foot of the monument to Joan of Arc in Paris took place against the background of 30 children standing in line, each representing one of the countries of Europe, including the Soviet Union. And this was not simply advertising hype on the eve of the European elections, in which Jean-Marie Le Pen, who is still the leader of an ultraright-wing group of deputies in the European parliament, hopes to take revenge for his defeat in the elections to the National Assembly of the French Republic. This is a symbol of his ambitions.

"I should like to meet Jean-Marie Le Pen and get to know this courageous person who is speaking out against American domination in Europe," said D. Vasilyev to French television correspondents as he stood under a portrait of Nicholas II.

But Le Pen has a different dream.

"I would like to meet the Reverend Moon" (Sun Myung Moon—based in the United States, the creator of the so-called "association for the unification of world Christianity," one of the most powerful conservative organizations of the West—K.P.)—declared the leader of the French right wing, speaking on the short-wave radio station "Grand—Oral—Liberation—Pacifique FM." "He is a real anticommunist. If they say that Moon is involved in the drug trade, it is slander."

Birds of a feather flock together: Jean-Marie Le Pen with his "European" ambitions and the South Korean Moon, who has declared America the "country chosen by God," and A. Vasilyev... in the black T-shirt of "Pamyat."

Official Confirms Arming of Aeroflot Crews

PM1606120189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 89 p 2

[Reader's letter and reply by A. Bondarev, chief of "Flight Safety Department": "Gun-Toting Pilots?"]

[Text] "Is it true that Aeroflot is the only airline in the world whose pilots are armed with pistols?

"V. Sedlov, Novosibirsk."

Here is what A. Bondarev, Flight Safety Department chief, replies:

"Yes indeed, some members of aircraft crews are supplied with firearms for the purpose of ensuring flight safety. This measure was adopted following a government decision at the time when the "Airborne Militia" was taken off the airliners. The latter now operates at airports jointly with the departmental passenger and cargo safety service. Most foreign airlines have taken a different path—they have set up powerful and centralized ground-based security services."

Economic

Economists, Deputies Address News Conference 16 Jun

Discuss 'Crisis Phenomena,' Reform

LD1606174389 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The first Congress of People's Deputies gave a clear and ruthlessly precise picture of the true state of affairs in the national economy, which makes it possible to work out an adequate concept of economic reform, believe prominent economists and people's deputies.

Addressing the first news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists in Moscow after the congress, Academician Leonid Abalkin described improving finances as the key issue in overcoming crisis phenomena in the Soviet economy.

The scientist, nominated to the post of deputy prime minister, stressed the need for a sharp reduction in state investments in the production sphere and the mandatory liquidation of loss-making enterprises within the next 18 months.

"To resolve social problems that may arise in this connection, one can use the experience already gained when enterprises are leased or transformed into cooperatives," Abalkin said.

Academician Oleg Bogomolov said that economic reform in the Soviet Union is impossible without resolving such key issues as forming a free market and curbing inflation now running, according to his estimates, at 10-11 per cent a year.

Bogomolov believed that 150 billion roubles in "extra" money, which destabilises the market, should be excluded from circulation.

Gennadiy Lisichkin, doctor of economics, suggested taking money emission away from government control and handing it over directly to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The economist expressed the view that many crisis phenomena in the economy were due to half-measures envisaged in major decisions, specifically on the creation of conditions for a free market in the country.

Vladimir Tikhonov, member of the Agriculture Academy of the USSR, said that a land reform that would eliminate the departmental and state monopoly in agriculture was required for the radical solution of the food problem. Land should become property of the entire people not on paper, but in reality.

Replying to a question put by a correspondent of the Japanese newspaper ASAHI about the possibility of forming a multi-party political system in the Soviet Union, professor Gavriil Popov stressed his commitment to the existing one-party system.

He said that, given due development of intra-party democracy, various issues can be widely debated within the framework of one party and the highest body of state authority represented by numerous public organisations.

"We have considerable reserves and opportunities for that," he remarked.

Congress Debate Continues

PM2006093289 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Yu. Ursov report under the rubric "From Authoritative Sources": "Scientists Propose"]

[Text] A news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held at the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute on Friday 16 June; it was addressed by well-known economists and USSR people's deputies O. Bogomolov, G. Lisichkin, G. Popov, and V. Tikhonov. An assessment of the present state of the economy, the causes of the crisis, and alternative ways of tackling the problems that have accumulated—that is how Academician L. Abalkin defined the theme of the news conference.

The news conference was a kind of continuation of the congress debate. O. Bogomolov spoke out quite clearly: In the years of radical reform of the economy, the

country has not emerged from the crisis. The congress, in his view, was unable to formulate an integrated concept for economic revival, which should begin with agriculture. V. Tikhonov's position was similar: The production of agricultural produce can only be increased by implementing an agrarian reform as a result of which the peasant would at last become the real owner of the land. The congress, V. Tikhonov believes, did not bring agriculture much closer to that situation.

These and other views undoubtedly supplement the general picture of the critical condition of the economy. The speakers emphasized that it is necessary to emerge from this crisis first and foremost by improving the disordered financial system, balancing the market, and eliminating the state budget deficit. In these areas there were apparently no differences of opinion with the official reports to the congress. But unfortunately, there were also no answers to these questions: How, specifically, can this be done, where do you start?

One can, of course, agree with Academician L. Abalkin: Concrete proposals on each tricky area of the economy can hardly be expected while economic debates are taking place at the conceptual level. But before giving preference to a particular concept, it would be a good idea for our legislators—the people's deputies—to be aware of its advantages and shortcomings, backed up by economic calculations; what we lose and what we gain by choosing a given option. In this connection one could recall the radical measures proposed at the congress by G. Popov: to redistribute in a given proportion the objects and forms of ownership. But at the news conference, where he also spoke, it emerged that there is no mathematical model to confirm the economic effectiveness of this attractive idea. There are only rough estimates by experts. How can we bring the economy out of crisis on the basis of approximations? The responsibility for failure is too great. We know only too well what was and is bad about our economy. And thanks to the scientists we also know what it should be like in principle. The most difficult thing remains: to define a way of making the transition from one state to the other.

Shmelev on Congress Economic Discussions

18200384 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 9 Jun 89 p 2

[Interview with doctor of economic sciences Professor N. Shmelev by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent L. Telen, during a break in the proceedings of the Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin Hall of Congresses; date not specified: "Radical Measures Are Needed"]

[Text] During a break in the proceedings of the congress, our correspondent met with doctor of economic sciences Professor N. Shmelev.

[Telen] All of us waited impatiently for the economic discussion. It appears that it is getting under way on the 12th day of the congress, after a report by the chairman of the Council of Ministers.

[Shmelev] Thank God. Let us recall the course of the discussion in previous days. Many tears were shed; there were lots of complaints about our woes and problems which indeed abound. However, we did not assemble here at the congress in order to complain to each other about our life. We need proposals for, and better yet, a program of restoring health to the economy of the country.

[Telen] Judging by your speech in the forum of the congress, proposals of the prime minister do not appear radical enough to you.

[Shmelev] In general, I consider myself an optimist, and believe that, having depleted [the potential of] command and administrative methods, we will steer toward the course of normal goods-and-money relations, develop the market, and will forever forget about semi-feudal methods of economic management. However, this is for the long run. I am convinced that at present the government underestimates the gravity of the situation.

[Telen] And this is why it believes that even restoring health to the budget can be dragged out for a decade....

[Shmelev] And what about the measures suggested for saturating the market with consumer goods? Are they effective enough? Simple calculations reveal that the increment in their production proposed by the government will be offset in its entirety by the increment in income. What about pent-up demand? This money will continue to put pressure on the market. Therefore, I am fully convinced that, unless a program of extraordinary measures is adopted, the 2 to 3 years to come may bring about an economic catastrophe in the country—total decay of the market, and financial collapse. As has happened many times in the history of mankind, this will be followed by comprehensive rationing and a return to harsh administrative control.

[Telen] Are you sure that your program will take us away from the brink of the abyss?

[Shmelev] What I have been and am proposing is confirmed by calculations. Let us look at them yet again.

First, I have called for a transition to regular sales of alcohol, and suffocating the moonshiners economically—at present, they account for almost one-half of alcohol production. This is a direct loss for the budget.

Second, we must sell the land to all those who want to buy it, or at the very least lease it for long periods of time. We should immediately sell off at contractual prices all

stocks and hard-to-sell goods—equipment, machine tools, materials, on one condition, however: Some of the proceeds of this sale will be appropriated by the budget and destroyed.

Third, imports of goods—definitely! 5 to 6 billion dollars spent in this manner will make it possible to draw into circulation within a short period of time 150 million "hot" rubles, which the people have now accumulated, and which are not working for the economy.

[Telen] Where are we to get the extra dollars? It looks like we just do not have them.

[Shmelev] It is not so. We can find the hard currency right away. Why should not we, for example, settle in hard currency with our domestic collective and state farms—they are prepared to sell grain two times cheaper than American farmers? Why should we not reconsider some state-to-state obligations—according to Western estimates, they come to between $22 and $24 billion a year? Should we go on buying machine tools in the West while those not installed worth 10 billion rubles have already piled up? Finally, we should not give up on foreign loans as well.

[Telen] You have made many of these proposals before. Have they been considered by the government?

[Shmelev] As far as I know, it has not considered them in their entirety. However, people from the Council of Ministers have stated their point of view on some issues. For example, the chairman of the Council of Ministers has referred to foreign loans in his report.

[Telen] As far as I recall, he rejected your idea.

[Shmelev] Yes, but I still think his arguments are not convincing. The loans are dangerous if we do not restructure our economic system within 2 to 3 years. In that event, we will indeed eat the loans away as nonsensically as we have the petrodollars. I am convinced that a healthy economy makes it possible to borrow money (certainly, in a prudent manner).

[Telen] As we have heard, the report calls for reducing expenditures. Does it appear that proposals by economic scientists in this matter as well are more radical?

[Shmelev] Yes, it is so. I believe that those who follow economic publications are aware of my point of view. I will name just two measures which, as I see it, are capable of ameliorating the situation considerably, and reducing social tensions. An abrupt reduction, by 30 to 40 percent, of capital investment; at present, we simply cannot afford "construction projects of the century." A stricter credit policy—loans to enterprises should be given, as a rule, at a high rate of interest....

[Telen] We have seen in the years past that many "contingency" measures for which the government has opted have not only failed to produce the success desired, but have exacerbated the situation. How do you explain this?

[Shmelev] By the fact that many measures by the government have been clearly outside the [domain of] economics. I do not mean just the campaign of combating non-labor-derived incomes, and the ill-conceived anti-alcohol decree. There have been more recent examples—restrictions on price-setting, constraints on income, cooperative bans. Certainly, coupons and ration cards for everything could be issued. Some people may even see this as logical. This, however, is the logic of poverty, and a humiliation for a modern economy. Any extraordinary measures should follow the general direction of the reform. Only the market can cure [the ills of] the market.

[Telen] A stenographic record of your speech will be published in the newspapers only in another day. Could you repeat your proposals to the congress?

[Shmelev] To acknowledge that only the congress has a right to adopt the budget of our country. To envisage a reduction in the deficit to 10 or 20 billion rubles as soon as next year. To release statistics on the state debt to the populace and foreign lenders. To make the Central Bank an independent body in charge of currency emission and inflation in our country, and to ensure that its chairman report to the congress only.

[Telen] Let us hope that the people's deputies will not just listen to your proposals, but will act on them.

Agricultural

Change in Food Imports Policy Urged

18270107 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 4 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by A. Sizov, senior scientific associate, USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute: "Lopsidedness and Minuses"]

[Text] In recent times, every fourth kilogram of butter and vegetable oil, every third roll and package of sugar, every second kilogram of macaroni products, is bought or produced from imported raw materials. On the average, about 20 percent of all the country's import goes for foreign foodstuffs purchases and raw materials for their production. This is an extraordinary figure. Even in India, with its population of 800 million, this is about 9 percent.

Meanwhile, world prices for many agricultural goods are growing. Over 1 year, they have increased by almost 70 percent for raw sugar, 60 percent for wheat, and 20 percent for soybeans. The discounts to importers of

agricultural products are becoming less and less significant. This year, in order to support the purchasing volume of previous years, a supplemental allocation of $1.5 billion is required. Our export situation remains complex: The foreign supply of raw materials is physically limited, and a price increase for it is not foreseen. Time is needed to adjust the production of prepared products capable of competing in the foreign market.

What do we import? First and foremost, raw goods: grain, raw sugar, and oil-bearing seeds. About two-thirds of all imports go to them; their volume reaches 30-40 million metric tons. But after all, all of this must somehow be stored and processed. With our extremely backward storage and processing base, this is a difficult task to fulfill. How do they resolve it? The energies of the country's APK [agro-industrial complex] are turned toward imported raw materials at the cost of reducing the volume of processing volume of domestic materials. Thus, the losses of the agricultural products produced in our country are in my regards the direct result of the additional load on the production structure of the APK by the multi-million import of agricultural raw materials. And the more foreign purchases, the higher the losses!

There is no need to speak of the efficacy of such imports. It is simply a "minus" sign. For example, the return from imported grain to feed cattle, under the existing imbalances in feed production, is extremely low. The expenses for the production of a single unit of animal husbandry are extraordinarily high (1.5-2 times higher than in the United States). As a result, we waste hard currency to purchase feed, and we produce meat, for which the state pays agricultural enterprises a subsidy. All of this, incidentally, is not from the departmental pocket, but from yours and mine, both the foreign currency and the rubles which go toward subsidies. God save us from further such increase in such efficacy.

True, the departments involved babble about the international division of labor. But look! The structure of foreign purchases is dominated by products for the production of which we have all the necessary conditions. These are grain, meat, and oil-bearing seeds...up to potatoes. We invest billions in hard currency (100 billion per 5-year plan) in things which we must produce for ourselves. The international division of labor has nothing to do with this at all.

At the same time, we economize on imports of vegetables, fruits, coffee, tea, and citrus fruit. Does anyone in the government remember the health of the people? The population is forced to consume more and more fats. A third of the country suffers from overweight; in many respects, this is the cause of arteriosclerosis, ischemic heart disease, and cancers. Vitamin deficiency reaches 70 percent, especially in winter months. Children pay the price for this in poor vision, dental caries, predisposition to disease, rickets, and other misfortunes. Thus, we import agricultural raw materials which go toward the production of the animal fats which destroy our health. The very products needed to strengthen it are considered by the government to be insignificant.

Meanwhile, in all developed countries, importation of foodstuffs is one of the most important sources of the population's balanced diet. For example, the consumption of citrus fruits in the FRG, Sweden, and Canada, countries with climates similar to ours, ranges from 21 to 28 kg per person annually, compared with our 2 kg. We consume 200 grams of other tropical fruits; they consume 50-60 times more. This is, of course, on the average. Considering the peculiarities of distribution of imported goods in our country, in many regions, children know about oranges, bananas, and pineapples only from pictures. The majority of us have in general never heard of many others available to the average consumer in Western countries (avocado, kiwi, papaya).

The large-scale import over many years of agricultural products which we can produce for ourselves is not simply a waste of hard currency. It breeds a dependent state of mind in the areas of preparation and processing, and has, in fact, become a hindrance to the development of domestic production. Let us take the "Common Market": It was the goal-oriented foreign foodstuffs policy which transformed the countries of the EEC from importers into the world's second largest exporter of cereals. We have nothing resembling such a policy. Therefore, the country changed from being an exporter to being an importer, a serious one and a long-term one.

Nevertheless, reducing the traditional import of grain and oil is possible and necessary. We are being strongly sucked into a funnel of foreign dependency. In order to avoid interruptions, resources should be switched from reducing the import of raw provisions to expanding the purchase of meat products, fresh and processed vegetables and fruits, coffee, tea, and other tropical products. This will sharply increase the budgetary efficacy of import, and lower the load on the storage and processing branches. On the other hand, effective measures must be taken to stimulate internal production, even up to opening hard currency accounts to agricultural enterprises which produce import-replacement products in excess of contractual obligations with state procurement services.

In a word, the main thing is not the economy of hard currency for foodstuffs, but the rational utilization of hard currency.

Can an effective foreign foodstuffs policy be introduced within the framework of the existing departmental structure? I doubt it. Everything is so disjointed between the various "districts" that conducting any sort of integrated foreign foodstuffs policy linked with a domestic policy is practically impossible. The foreign trade organizations active in the area of foodstuffs are themselves so bound by instructions from above that we cannot even speak of any sort of independent action. Their circle of operations is fixed; they do not have the right to replace one item

with another having similar consumer qualities. Even if millions can be saved by doing so, this is not allowed. In effect, they are also removed from purchase within the country as well.

Therefore, if we are seriously interested in the genuinely effective activity of our foreign trade organizations, then they must be freed from departmental subordination, and become independent economic units. The state must conclude contracts with them, possibly on a competitive basis, but their execution is the sole prerogative of the foreign trade organizations themselves. From whom they should be buying, domestically or abroad, is for them to decide, based upon the task of saving hard currency, a portion of which should be given to the complete disposal of these organizations. That is when the foreign traders will find not only the Western farmer, but the Soviet farmer, from whom he will be able to buy more cheaply, and with mutual advantage.

Foreign foodstuffs policy cannot be narrowly specific, branch-departmental. Otherwise, we are destined to be lopsided both in agrarian policy as a whole, and in providing the people with products.

Scientific

Correction to 'Mir' Program Costs, Shuttle Plans

WA2006132989

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "'Mir' Program Costs, Shuttle Plans," published in the 14 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 73-76:

page 75, column two, last paragraph, sentence two make read: ...one, equipped with a docking unit and a mechanical... (changing 'attachment node' to 'docking unit')

same paragraph, next sentence, make read: ...elements of the cosmonaut rescue system. The schedule is... (rewording).

Military

Possible Causes of MiG-29 Crash Noted

18290201 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Jun 89 p 4

[Article by A. Nadzharov: "What Happened at Le Bourget?"]

[Text] Millions of television viewers saw the accident of the MiG-29 fighter during a demonstration flight at Le Bourget. All of them are troubled by the question: What was the cause?

A specially created French commission to investigate the cause of the accident is seeking a preliminary answer to the question. A Soviet group of observers is cooperating with the commission to help analyze what happened. The group includes a pilot, Menitskiy, the aircraft's chief designer, Valdenberg, and the director of the Institute of Aviation Engine Construction, Ogorodnikov.

And what do they think about the accident in Moscow? At the Main Staff of the VVS [Air Force] of the USSR Ministry of Defense, we asked pilot-specialists to comment on what happened. They all saw the television shots and came to the opinion that the cause of the accident could not have been a pilot error. They all advised asking the creators of the aircraft.

This is what was said by N. Laptev, the deputy chief of the Scientific and Technical Center of the USSR Aviation Industry:

"It is still too early to talk about the causes of the accident—because the investigation has just started. We have to decode the recording of the instruments and to listen to the suppositions of A. Kvochur, the pilot, who was able to eject himself almost at the point where the aircraft hit the ground. He feels normal, and he is already taking part in the investigation into the causes of the accident."

"Perhaps the aircraft was manufactured with some defects?"

"It is difficult to believe this. Both at the time of test flights back home in our country and during the recent air display in the English city of Farnborough it was exactly this model aircraft that showed itself to be outstanding. And here in Le Bourget the general opinion was that the aircraft would become the highlight of the exposition."

"Then, what is the problem?"

"So far there are only suppositions. One of them is that there was some kind of a malfunction in the operation of the power unit. The reason could have been the flight itself at low altitude—to 300 meters. It is not excluded that suddenly some outside object could have gotten into the engine here—for example, a bird. Despite this, the high skill of Pilot Kvochur must be noted: Because of him we did not have any victims, which frequently accompany events at international air shows."

In fact, accidents have almost become required elements at international air shows. It is enough to mention last year's catastrophe in the FRG, which cost 10 lives.

Unfortunately, equipment is equipment. No one can give a guarantee of complete safety. The moreso that at such public displays both the designers and the pilots strive to show everything that the aircraft are capable of. Despite what happened, I must emphasize that our country has successfully entered the international aviation market, which is to say at a relatively high level of Soviet design thinking, perfection of engineering decisions, and production technology.

Yesterday at 1700, the so-called "black box," with instrument recordings which were working on the aircraft that had the accident, was flown from Paris to Moscow. Specialists have started to study the data.

As soon as it became known, the French side confirmed the high probability of the MiG's collision with a flock of birds.

Military Industry Conversion Viewed

18070657 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Academician B. Ponomarev: "The Potential of Conversion. What Switching Military Production to Peacetime Rails Promises"]

[Text] **"The trade unions favor practical disarmament." An international scientific-practical trade union conference held by the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] and the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Council on the international workers' movement took place in late April in Moscow. Some 275 delegates from 112 countries took part and discussed disarmament problems, the socioeconomic consequences of the scientific and technical revolution and the growing ecological threat.**

The representatives of the workers' movement expressed great alarm in connection with the fact that in the NATO countries, especially the United States and Britain, the arms buildup is not being halted but even increased. The business of modernizing tactical nuclear weapons in Europe is being persistently pursued. And all this at a time when the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries are making unilateral cuts in their own arms and armed forces. Under these conditions the problem of conversion—switching military production to civilian production—has become particularly acute.

Trade union figures from various countries have now for some years been seeking out specific ways to solve this problem. Just recall the initiatives of the shop stewards at a number of military firms in Britain: They worked out detailed and very convincing alternative plans for civilian production at the Lucas Aerospace, British Aerospace and Vickers companies. The British Trade Union Congress has published a special brochure on conversion.

Way back in 1978 in the United States the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM) published a study in which, the opinion of a number of economists interest West notwithstanding, the positive effect of conversion on employment was proven.

However, the present-day reality demands that optimal technical, economic and social solutions be found that would be acceptable to all parties involved in effecting conversion. In this sense a study conducted in Sweden is of great interest; Sweden was the first to respond to a UN appeal to draw up a national scenario for disarmament.

The experience gained in a number of countries over the past decades can hardly be considered quite adequate. However, it has convincingly confirmed two fundamental factors. First of all the possibility of switching from an economy of armament to an economy of disarmament is quite realistic. Moreover, confidence in this can be seen in increasing numbers of workers and trade union and political figures. We can agree fully with the American, Professor (Dzh.Ye. Ullmen), who has said that turning back the arms race is not simply beautiful and moral but is also "a condition for the physical existence" of any state.

Great interest was evoked among those attending the conference by a report of conversion in the Soviet Union, something about which the Western press is writing almost nothing. Immediately after the elimination of the missiles in accordance with the Influence Treaty, a start was made in the USSR to switch many military enterprises to the production of peacetime output. Some 345 plants operating in the defense industry have been switched to the production of equipment for the food industry, and 200 scientific institutes have also been switched to peacetime work. This year 40 percent of output from enterprises in the defense complex will go for peacetime needs, and after 2 years this proportion will reach 60 percent. Work has been started to draw up a program for the conversion of military production on a nationwide scale. In short, we are in fact effecting the principle of switching from an economy of armament to one of disarmament.

The total experience of the various countries in the conversion of military production, the scientific quests and a present-day practice make it possible to formulate a number of useful practical conclusions.

First, for successful realization of conversion it is necessary to solve a number of strategic tasks: first and foremost expanding and deepening the disarmament process at a different qualitative level, and building security at both the regional and global levels in the spirit of the new political thinking. This includes the need to affirm the principle of sufficiency in defensive arms and the reorientation of all military structures exclusively for nonoffensive defense.

It is also expedient to consider a number of measures that are of particular importance in the context of conversion processes:

—halting and banning the use of the achievements of science and technology to develop and produce new generations and kinds of weapons of mass destruction, and also conventional weapons systems;

—preventing the use of new technologies to develop weapons, first and foremost laser weapons and genetic and electromagnetic agents.

Second, decisive importance should, in my opinion, be attached to state planning and leadership in this field. And what is needed for this is appropriate legislation and government decisions and the creation of national organs with the necessary powers. The trade unions should play a most active part in their activity. Here, the following problems should be considered:

—drawing up programs for alternative production facilities and determining the kinds of peacetime out put to be produced by military enterprises;

—assessing the capital investments needed, along with changes in equipment and technologies and the organization of labor;

—creating new work places and providing guarantees for income for workers and employees and help in job placement and professional retraining.

Third, during the course of the implementation of conversion an extremely important mission falls to the working class and its organizations, first and foremost its mass organizations, namely, the trade unions, whose interests cover all aspects of this problem.

A trade union program of action on conversion, which was discussed in December 1988 at a meeting of the Dubno international trade union committee in Limassol, Cyprus, which proclaimed the slogan "The Trade Unions for Practical Disarmament," could be effective and useful. This kind of program should make provision for work on the concept of conversion, first and foremost its social aspect, and principles for alternative plans, but in the kind of practical measures discussed in Limassol:

—setting up conversion centers under the aegis of the trade unions around which other public and scientific forces could rally;

—putting pressure on parliaments and governments to prompt them to practical implementation of the appeals and state recommendations made under the UN aegis by the International Conference on Links between Disarmament and Development;

—shaping a special program on conversion problems within the framework of the International Labor Office (ILO), with a view to realizing the ideas set forth in the ILO resolution on economic and social aspects of disarmament;

—organizing a campaign for practical disarmament and setting up national conversion foundations;

—studying problems concerning the interconnection between disarmament and conversion on the one hand and preventing ecological catastrophe, on the other.

The powerful potential of the working class and its professional and political organizations comprise an important social base for the movement for peace and disarmament that has assumed the form of "people's diplomacy."

The working class has a great and decisive means. For all weapons are produced by its hands. And it has both the right and the strength to dispose of them in its own its and the interests of all peoples, and not to use those hands to produce the means whereby people can be destroyed.

Comparison of Yazov TASS Interview

PM2006094589

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 June 1989 publishes in its Second Edition on page 4 an unnamed TASS correspondent interview with Soviet Defense Minister Yazov. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "Toward a New Model of Security. Discussion Between Army General D.T. Yazov, Candidate Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Defense Minister, With a TASS Correspondent" with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version, published in the 19 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, beginning on page 117, reveals the following variations:

The PRAVDA version omits opening and closing quotation marks;

page 117, PRAVDA version omits introductory paragraph;

page 118, column one, paragraph one, only sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...process of democratization of the world order. The fundamentals and... (substituting "the world order" for "world significance");

page 118, column one, paragraph five, only sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...of the restructuring of Soviet defense building and the USSR Armed Forces. I would like you to clear up... (offering press rendering of passage indistinctly received on TASS);

page 118, column one, last paragraph, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...formations are being modernized. Operational and combat... (substituting "modernized");

page 118, column two, last paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...such an approach, reflected, in particular, in a constructive position at the talks, is capable of... (adding additional material);

page 119, column one, paragraph four, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...proposals for reducing armaments and armed forces... (offering press rendering of word indistinctly received on TASS);

page 119, column one, last paragraph, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...States beyond their national territory borders, and... (subbing "national" for "natural");

page 120, first column, last paragraph, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...Navies armed with the most modern... (supplying PRAVDA rendering of passage indistinctly received on TASS);

page 120, first column, same paragraph, same sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...considerable offensive might. But the whole... (supplying PRAVDA rendering);

page 121, second column, second paragraph, penultimate sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...development and outline together the goals of their policies... (supplying PRAVDA rendering of passage indistinctly received on TASS).